

**A HISTORY OF COMMUNITY LEARNING  
AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND (CLANZ), 1988-2004  
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO AN ANALYSIS OF FUNDING  
APPLICATIONS & GRANTS**

**ROBERT TOBIAS**

**COMMISSIONED BY ACE AOTEAROA FOR THE TERTIARY  
EDUCATION COMMISSION TE AMORANGI MÄTAURANGA  
MATUA**

**MAY 2005**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report begins with an overview of the history of CLANZ. It highlights the fact that CLANZ was never funded by government to the extent that was initially recommended. In spite of this, the report provides evidence that CLANZ has played an important role in providing small-scale funding for a number of groups which might not otherwise have received any government funding to enable them to undertake adult education projects over the years. For the most part groups that were funded would not have seen themselves as 'educational'. However their contributions to adult and community education are highly significant. The report suggests that CLANZ has succeeded in a small way in contributing to many of the equity and citizenship goals which lay at the heart of its founders.

The report also highlights difficulties and tensions affecting CLANZ over the years. It argues that many of these arose out of the chronic underfunding by government of ACE community groups and organisations including CLANZ itself over many years. Other difficulties related to questions concerning the constitution and composition of CLANZ membership. Every effort was made by the Committee to secure a membership which continued to reflect the diversity of the field. However questions about the manner of appointment to CLANZ and the 'representativeness of its members were never resolved entirely satisfactorily. The report notes that in recent years a question mark has hung over CLANZ's future and that this too has given rise to difficulties. It examines some of the recent history of ACE and tertiary education and questions whether or not the proposals by the TEC are likely to produce a more effective way of distributing small grants for ACE programmes to community groups and organisations.

The number of applications and grants made by CLANZ each year are examined. A total of 5,212 applications worth nearly \$17 million overall were made, at an average of 326 applications per annum. Over the period from

1989 to 2004 CLANZ awarded a total of 2,917 grants at an average of 182 grants per annum. These grants were worth more than \$3.6 million at an average value of \$1,255 per grant. Overall, the values of all grants made over the period were as follows:

- 579, or 20% of all grants were for \$500 or less;
- 994 or 34% of grants were for amounts between \$501 and \$1000;
- 717 or 25% of grants were for amounts between \$1001 to \$1500;
- 232 or 11% were \$1501 to \$2000; and
- 295 or 10% were for amounts over \$2000.

The report also describes trends and patterns on a year-by-year basis. It notes that the number of applications has fallen away in 2003 and 2004, and suggests that this may have been occasioned in part by the introduction of the ACE Innovation & Development Fund in 2002.

The report examines what proportion of funding applications which were successful, as well as the reasons for the rejection of applications. Over the entire period, 56% of applications could be funded at least in part, with 42% receiving the full sum requested and 57% receiving part of the funds requested. A total of 2,295 applications, at an average of 143 per annum, were declined. This comprised 44% of all applications over the period. Forty-eight percent of applications which were not successful, were declined because the organisations making the applications or the applications themselves did not fit with CLANZ's funding criteria. Thirty-four percent were declined because they were for projects which were low on CLANZ's priorities. The remaining 16% were declined for a range of other reasons including a lack of sufficient information or because applications were withdrawn.

Information is provided on the kinds of groups, projects and programmes applying for and receiving grants over the years. Applications were received from a very wide range of voluntary organisations and community groups. Of all the groups which applied for funds, 41% were unsuccessful, 57% received no more than one grant per annum, and 2% received more than one grant in

any single year. The overwhelming majority, 93% of all groups and organisations applying to CLANZ, made only one application in any one year, while only 7% made more than one application.

Each project or programme was classified or coded by type on the basis of whether its primary focus was on providing 'information', 'education or training', 'networking' opportunities, or 'other' including running costs, salaries, buildings, etc. Overall, it seems that the overwhelming majority of applications (77%) were coded 'Education & training' and these applications, with 62% being successful, were also more likely to be approved for funding than any of the others. The second largest category of applications (with 9% of all applications) were those coded 'Networking'. Fifty percent of these were approved for funding. Overall the findings for the various types of project were as follows:

- 297 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Information', and of these 97 (or 33%) were successful;
- 4,022 (or 77% of all applications) were coded 'Education & training', and of these 2,495 (or 62%) were successful;
- 449 (or 9% of all applications) were coded 'Networking', and of these 225 (or 50%) were successful; and
- 441 (or 8% of all applications) were coded 'Other', and of these 100 (or 23%) were successful.

Each project or programme was also coded on the basis of its primary subject or programme area or field. These fields or areas were classified as follows: Community Development or Education; Family support education; Health education; Bicultural, race relations & Treaty education; Literacy; Maori Language & Culture; Education for New Settlers; Special needs education; Women's issues; Pacific Languages & Culture; Justice & Prison Education; and 'Other' forms of education. Examples are given of programmes and projects in the various fields and information on trends over the period is provided. Overall the findings on the number of applications and grants for projects in the various fields were as follows:

- 1,475 (or 28% of all applications) were coded 'Community education or development', and of these 824 (or 56%) were successful;
- 1,054 (or 20% of all applications) were coded 'Family support education', and of these 602 (or 57%) were successful;
- 470 (or 9% of all applications) were coded 'Health education', and of these 221 (or 47%) were successful; and
- 173 (or 3% of all applications) were coded 'Bicultural, race relations & Treaty education', and of these 117 (or 68%) were successful;
- 295 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Literacy', and of these 151 (or 51%) were successful;
- 588 (or 11% of all applications) were coded 'Maori Language & Culture', and of these 366 (or 62%) were successful;
- 130 (or 2% of all applications) were coded 'New Settlers' education', and of these 85 (or 65%) were successful; and
- 185 (or 4% of all applications) were coded 'Special needs', and of these 92 (or 50%) were successful;
- 383 (or 7% of all applications) were coded 'Women's issues', and of these 272 (or 71%) were successful;
- 96 (or 2% of all applications) were coded 'Pacific Languages & Culture', and of these 53 (or 55%) were successful;
- 53 (or 1% of all applications) were coded 'Justice & Prison Education', and of these 26 (or 49%) were successful; and
- 309 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Other', and of these 108 (or 35%) were successful.

The report then looks at the question whether there were any gender, ethnic, age or regional differences in the number and percentage of successful and unsuccessful applicants. On the question of gender, although the data suggest that there were considerable variations from year to year, overall the overwhelming majority of applications (78%) were for projects which were not explicitly gendered. Only 2% were explicitly intended for men while 20% were explicitly for women. The report includes some data shedding light on the question whether there were any gender-related differences in the proportions of applications which were successful in obtaining grants. Overall, 670 (or

64%) out of the 1,047 applications for women's programmes were successful, as compared with 69 (or 57%) out of 122 applications for men's programmes, and 2,178 (or 54%) out of 4,038 programmes for women and men.

On the question of ethnicity and cultural differences, although once again it seems that there were considerable variations from year to year, the overwhelming majority (78%) of all applications were for projects for which ethnicity or cultural background was not explicitly identified. On the other hand, 820 or 16% were explicitly for Maori projects, while 167 or 3% were explicitly intended for Pacific people, and 163 or 3% for people from other ethnic minorities. The report also examines the question whether there were any ethnic or cultural differences in the proportions of applications which succeeded in obtaining grants. Overall, 477 (or 58%) of the 820 applications for Maori programmes were successful. This compares with 2,243 (or 55%) of the 4,058 applications for programmes for Pakeha, unidentified or mixed groups; 93 (or 56%) of the 167 applications for programmes for Pacific people; and 104 (or 64%) of the 167 applications for people from other ethnic or cultural minorities. There do seem to be differences between the success rates of applications between ethnic or cultural groups, with the overall average for Maori projects and those of ethnic minorities being somewhat higher than the overall average.

The report then looks at the question whether age had any impact on the likelihood of benefiting from CLANZ funding. In discussing the possible impact of age, it notes that projects intended for children and school-age young people were not within CLANZ's funding criteria. Projects and programmes were required to be primarily intended for adults. The main finding of the report is that the overwhelming majority of both funding applications (92%) and grants were for projects for which age was not specified or relevant. Only 6% of applications and 3% of grants were explicitly intended for young people under 25, and 2% of applications and 3% of grants were for older people over 60.

Since such a high proportion of all successful applications were for non-age-specific projects, the report contains only limited data on the question whether there were any age-related differences in the proportions of applications which were successful. Overall, 94 (or 30%) of the 309 applications for projects intended for young people were successful. This compares with 75 (or 63%) out of the 119 applications for projects for people 60 and over, and 2,748 (or 57%) out of 4,780 projects which were not age-specific. On the basis of these figures it seems that projects for young people were least likely to be funded by CLANZ. This however is likely to reflect the fact that several applicants misunderstood or were unaware of the fact referred to above that CLANZ funding was not intended for projects for children.

Finally the report looks at questions concerning the regional distribution of applications and grants. Although the data do not allow us to draw any clear-cut comparisons in the distribution of applications and grants between rural and urban areas, it does seem that the rural/urban divide is not a clear-cut one.

For the purpose of making regional comparisons on a population basis the report draws on regional population data from the 1996 census. The following are findings on some regional similarities and differences:

- In a few regions such as Taranaki and Wanganui/Manawatu and Dunedin the proportions of funding applications and grants were very similar to the proportions of the New Zealand population living in those areas.
- In some regions there were higher proportions of funding applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis. This was the case in Northland, Hamilton, the Bay of Plenty, Hawkes Bay, the Wellington region (including urban Wellington), Nelson, Marlborough, the South Island West Coast and Dunedin.
- In some regions there were fewer applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis. This was the case in the Auckland Region (including urban Auckland), the Waikato, the East Cape,

Canterbury (including Christchurch), Otago (excluding Dunedin) and Southland.

It seems that there was little difference on a population basis between the North and South Islands in the overall distribution of applications and grants. Whereas 74.7% of the population lived in the North Island and 25.3% in the South Island in 1996, 74.2% of all applications and 73.3% of grants were awarded for groups in the North Island, as compared with 25.8% and 26.7% in the South Island.

The report concludes with some brief reflections on the findings of the research. These include suggestions for policy and further research. It refers to some of the positive aspects of CLANZ and its contributions, as well as some of its limitations and difficulties. These include its low level of funding through most of the period, as well as its limited mandate and the limited nature of the links between CLANZ, government and the wider field of ACE. Provided these limitations can be resolved in the future, the report suggests that CLANZ or a similar organisation has a potentially vital role to play in the future of ACE.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 SOURCES OF DATA USED IN THIS STUDY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3.0 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4.0 THE NUMBER &amp; VALUE OF APPLICATIONS &amp; GRANTS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 NUMBER & VALUE OF APPLICATIONS & GRANTS .....	14
4.2 NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS DECLINED & THE REASONS FOR THESE DECISIONS .....	19
4.3 ORGANISATIONS/GROUPS APPLYING FOR & RECEIVING GRANTS.....	23
<b>5.0 TYPES &amp; SUBJECT AREAS OF PROJECTS &amp; PROGRAMMES.....</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1 TYPES OF PROJECTS &PROGRAMMES.....	27
5.2 SUBJECT AREAS OF PROJECTS .....	30
5.2.1 COMMUNITY EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT .....	32
5.2.2 FAMILY SUPPORT EDUCATION .....	34
5.2.3 MAORI LANGUAGE AND CULTURE .....	37
5.2.4 HEALTH EDUCATION .....	39
5.2.5 WOMEN'S ISSUES .....	41
5.2.6 LITERACY .....	43
5.2.7 BI-CULTURAL, RACE RELATIONS & TREATY EDUCATION .....	46
5.2.8 SPECIAL NEEDS PROGRAMMES .....	48
5.2.9 NEW SETTLERS' PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES .....	50
5.2.10 PACIFIC LANGUAGE & CULTURAL PROGRAMMES .....	53
5.2.11 JUSTICE & PRISON EDUCATION .....	55
5.2.10 OTHER UNCLASSIFIED PROJECTS & PROGRAMMES .....	57
<b>6.0 GENDER, ETHNICITY &amp; AGE PROFILES OF SUCCESSFUL &amp; UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS .....</b>	<b>59</b>
6.1 GENDER .....	59
6.2 ETHNICITY .....	61
6.3 AGE .....	65
<b>5.0 SUMMARY &amp; REFLECTIONS .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>6.0 CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>7.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>APPENDIX B .....</b>	<b>88</b>

## **1.0 PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT**

The initial aim of this project was to investigate a number of questions in relation to the distribution of CLANZ funding over the period between 1989 and 2004. The report begins with an historical overview. It then looks at the number, value, nature & size of funding applications and grants over the period. In this report we analyse those grants which were approved, as well as those which were declined. Finally it examines questions about the kinds of groups which have benefited from CLANZ funding over the years.

The report concludes by suggesting a number of reasons why the work undertaken by CLANZ over the years should be continued. It also raises a number of questions which require further research.

## **2.0 SOURCES OF DATA USED IN THIS STUDY**

For its historical overview this report draws on a number of primary and secondary documents. These include material from CLANZ web page (CLANZ, 2005), copies of CLANZ minutes, reports and other papers (CLANZ, Various), together with a number of working party reports and other government documents (Adult Education & Community Learning Working Party, 2001; Hartley, 1989; Hawke, 1988; Herbert, 1990; Minister and Associate Minister of Education, 1989; Shallcrass, 1987; Tertiary Education Commission Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua, 2005). They also include various issues of AKINA, the Bulletin of the New Zealand Association for Community and Continuing Education (NZACCE, 1983-1999), Jim Dakin's history of the National Council of Adult Education (Dakin, 1988), and my own unpublished history (Tobias, 1999) as well as a recent publication looking at lifelong learning policies in Aotearoa from the 1970s to the 2000s (Tobias, 2004). Finally, sources consulted include a number of articles and papers dealing with changes in adult and community education in the late-1980s and early-1990s - a crucial time in the history of CLANZ (Harré Hindmarsh, 1992, 1996; Harré Hindmarsh & al, 1993; Harré Hindmarsh & Davies, 1993; Tobias, 1990, 1991; Tobias, 1993).

The other information used in this analysis was drawn from an electronic database held in Excel files. These files were developed and maintained for Community Learning Aotearoa New Zealand (CLANZ) over the years. They consist of information drawn from funding applications received by CLANZ from 1989 to 2004 and from the subsequent decisions by CLANZ concerning these applications.

Work on this analysis commenced on 18 November 2004. However the coding of most of the data had been done prior to this and the variables used in the analysis had been predetermined. The database has some limitations. A number of coding inaccuracies were identified. These reduce the reliability of some of the data. An attempt has been made to do some correcting and re-coding, but time constraints have limited the extent of crosschecking.

In order to facilitate the analysis, separate Excel files for each year were created. In addition, in order to strengthen the capacity to find and sort information on each application and programme funded, the data were converted into Filemaker files. These were used in combination with the Excel files to complete the analysis.

I wish to acknowledge with thanks the efficient support and encouragement provided by Philippa Conroy, as well as the work done over the years by a number of people in coding the data. Most recently I wish to thank Kyere Loren for coding the 2003 and 2004 data and Karin Downs for her help in providing some historical information.

### **3.0 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

The history of CLANZ dates back to 1988 when the Associate Minister of Education in the Labour Government announced the establishment of a new agency to be called initially the Committee for Independent Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CILANZ). However its origins can best be understood if we take a brief look further back in history. In 1964 the National Council of Adult Education (NCAE) was established by Act of Parliament. Its functions were wide-ranging. They included the following: giving information and advice

to the Department of Education on any matter relating to adult education; advising and assisting organisations and institutions engaged in adult education; initiating experimental and exploratory activities; calling conferences and fostering co-operation in the field; and generally taking ‘.. cognisance of the development of adult education, and [doing] whatever it considered desirable in order to stimulate activity in adult education’(Dakin: 55). Over the ensuing twenty years, from 1964 to 1984, substantial changes took place in all sectors of education as well as in common understandings of the roles and functions of key agencies and institutions such as the NCAE.

From the time of the election of the 4<sup>th</sup> Labour Government in mid-1984, there was considerable debate and discussion about the future of adult and community education (ACE). Inevitably much of this debate was about priorities, government funding and the structures for developing policy and providing advice for government and for those working in the field of ACE. One focus of this debate was on the nature, function and constitution of the NCAE, and this debate gave rise to some conflicts. As a consequence of this in December 1986 the Minister of Education announced a decision to withdraw government funding of the National Council of Adult Education. He said that the funds released from this would be used to provide some funding of community groups engaged in community education, and that an interim advisory group on non-formal education would be appointed ‘...to advise him on the distribution of these funds, on the terms of reference and method of appointment of an advisory committee on non-formal education, and on the type of organisation that can best serve the needs of non-formal education and be accountable to the groups that use it’ (Shallcrass, 1987: 6).

In September 1987 this Interim Advisory Group on Non-formal Education (IAGNE) presented its report. Unlike the NCAE, whose terms of reference had covered all forms of non-formal and formal adult and community education; the group's focus had been directed to those forms of adult education which take place outside educational institutions. The group argued that the essential distinguishing feature of non-formal education lay in the fact that it was controlled by groups of learners themselves ‘independently of imposed

curricula, of outside professionals or of institutions' (Shallcrass, 1987: 6). It noted that probably as much as 80% of deliberate learning takes place outside institutions, but that less than 0.01% of the education budget was devoted to non-formal i.e. non-institutional education. It argued further that a good deal of this self-education is undertaken by those who have long since been alienated from formal education.

In view of this it recommended that funding for non-formal education should be progressively increased over three years to 2% of the post-school education budget. In addition, it recommended that the NCAE be disestablished, and that a 12-member Committee for Independent Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CILANZ), elected by groups and voluntary organisations involved in community and non-formal education and serviced by a small unit in the department of education, be set up 'to advise the Minister of Education on all aspects of non-formal learning, including community education programmes within institutions, to consult with and respond to people involved in non-formal learning, to distribute funds to non-formal learning groups, [and] to promote and foster non-formal learning' (Shallcrass, 1987: 11). In addition, the group recommended that a National Resource Centre for Adult Education (NRC) be set up as a Trust or incorporated society with limited on-going funding and permanent staffing. Its members would include representatives of educational institutions as well as voluntary organisations and community groups, and it would take over the assets of the NCAE and carry out those other functions including communications, networking and research that had been undertaken by NCAE. Very shortly after receiving the report the new Associate Minister of Education accepted the recommendation to set up a Committee for Independent Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CILANZ), and by mid-1988 this Committee had been established. Its main functions were to support voluntary adult and community education organisations and community groups through the provision of grants, and to provide advice to the Minister of Education on nonformal and community education.

ACE was not the only education sector under scrutiny at that time. Groups, task forces and committees had been reviewing every aspect of education over the previous years. In 1988 a group of officials produced a summary report drawing together the findings of all the previous groups, and recommending a wide range of reforms of post-compulsory education. It included the field of non-formal and community education within its brief. As a consequence of this, in 1989 the government re-affirmed its previous decisions, with some relatively minor modifications. In 1989 CILANZ was re-named Community Learning Aotearoa/New Zealand (CLANZ). It retained its functions of advising the Minister of Education on ACE and allocating small grants to community groups as well as adding the role of advising the Ministry of Education on the processes and criteria for the approval of 'chartered providers' of ACE programmes. In addition, in terms of the 1990 Education Amendment Act, which was the major instrument of reform of post compulsory education of those years, the NCAE was formally disestablished, and, as recommended earlier by IAGNE, a National Resource Centre for Adult Education and Community Learning (NRC) with no statutory powers took its place. The reform process thus left ACE with no agency with statutory authority to stimulate and support ACE activities, and no recognised and established procedures for the election of members to CLANZ.

On the other hand, in the late-1980s - the final years of the 1984-1990 Labour government - there were signs that IAGNE's other recommendation regarding the progressive increase in funding of nonformal community education was being taken seriously. The funds allocated by government to CLANZ increased from 136,000 in 1987-8 to 452,000 in 1988-9, to \$485,000 in 1989-90, and \$525,000 in 1990-1. This of course came nowhere near the 2% of expenditure on post-school educations recommended by IAGNE. Nevertheless it was a start, and the Committee set about establishing procedures for advertising and allocating funds to local groups in ways which encouraged applications by those who traditionally might not have heard about the availability of such funds or who might have found it difficult to make formal applications.

From the time of the election of the new National government in November 1990 all this changed. With no statutory authority and no strong political base, CLANZ lost its function of advising the Minister of Education. Moreover, although CLANZ continued to allocate small grants to community groups and voluntary organisations, from the time of the government's first budget in 1991 CLANZ's budget, along with that of many other groups, was reduced by 60% to a total of \$210,000, with \$200,000 for allocation to groups and \$10,000 for use on administrative expenses. This massive cut had a number of effects on CLANZ and its work. In December 1991 CLANZ reported as follows:

'Because of the reduction in operating budget and in responsibilities, CLANZ's method of operating has had to change. The committee has reduced from 12 members to 8... It is no longer possible for the committee to meet around the country and to meet with local community groups in the way it did in the past. Sadly, meetings are now of necessity for one day only and in Wellington - this because it is the cheapest place to gather. The newsletter has also been discontinued.' (*AKINA* - the ACE Bulletin, NZ Association for Community and Continuing Education, No 37, December 1991: 39)

The Committee also noted that the former distinction between grants under \$1,500 (which could be considered on a quarterly basis) and those over \$1,500 (which were considered only once a year) no longer applied. Grants could be of any size. 'However, with the reduced budget and ever-growing demand, smaller grants are more likely to be successful.' CLANZ expressed its deep concern 'at the lack of any independent advice to the Minister of Education on this very important branch of adult learning.'

Over the following years CLANZ faced other difficulties. With the limited funds available to all groups, tensions arose from time to time. For example there is evidence of tension on at least one occasion between CLANZ and the NZACCE over the question of funding for the latter's annual conference. These tensions inevitably raised questions concerning CLANZ's mandate from the field. Questions about the manner of appointment to CLANZ were never resolved entirely satisfactorily. Every effort was made by the Committee to secure a membership which continued to reflect the diversity of the field. Thus efforts were made to ensure that Maori, Pakeha and Pacific people were effectively represented. Organisations and groups from the various cultural

communities, regions and communities of interest were approached to nominate members to CLANZ as vacancies occurred. A gender balance was sought as well as a balance between rural and urban areas and between the North Island and the South Island. It was agreed that ideally no member should serve on the Committee for longer than three years. However it was also agreed that there was a need for balance between 'old-hands' and newcomers. Finally and most importantly, it was agreed that members should also be appointed in the light of their general qualities (such as reliability, ability to communicate effectively, & willingness to do the work necessary) as well the specific skills and knowledge they might bring to the work of the Committee (including their specific networks, skills in promotion and publicity, and an ability to engage in political lobbying).

In spite of the setbacks referred to earlier, the CLANZ continued to carry out its responsibilities over the ensuing years. In most years it continued to meet four times a year with a view to ensuring that funding was not tied to a once-a-year round. Occasional meetings and correspondence with successive Ministers of Education took place, and in 1998 the Committee wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out the need for more funding. However the major focus was on the allocation of funds to community groups. In its publicity material (See for example Appendix A) CLANZ stated that it:

distributes funds to non-formal & community learning groups; promotes & fosters non-formal learning & community learning; and consults with & responds to people involved in non-formal & community learning.

It goes on:

At all times we consider applications in terms of our responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi. We fund only specific learning projects or programmes for adults.

*We give priority to:*

- Projects & programmes of groups which don't have easy access to other funding;
- Learning opportunities to make things fairer and strengthen people's choices;
- Learning opportunities outside the control of school, polytechnics & universities.
- Projects where the learners have control of the learning, rather than those where others decide what people need to learn;



- Local or regional groups rather than national bodies.

*We give low priority to:*

- training for individuals;
- expensive equipment;
- groups receiving direct funding from Government;
- national gatherings and conferences.

*We do not fund:*

- ongoing salaries & general administration costs;
- vehicles & buildings;
- institutions such as schools & polytechnics;
- projects mainly for children;
- overseas travel.

The position of CLANZ did not change significantly until after the election of the Labour/Alliance government in November 1999. Since that time however a question mark has hung over its future.

In its election manifesto the Labour Party stated that it was 'firmly committed to formally recognising and supporting [ACE]' (New Zealand Labour Party, 1999). It gave quite detailed consideration to the ACE sector. Among other things, it envisaged the following: increasing and stabilising funding for the sector; extending local involvement in the planning and delivery of ACE, in particular by establishing a number of Community Learning Programmes (CLPs); and enhancing the role of the NRC and increasing its funding to ensure that it has the capacity to perform a wide range of functions. These functions would include providing ongoing advice to the Minister of Education and to the field of ACE, gathering and disseminating relevant information, & being an advocate for ACE. In order to implement its policies it envisaged the appointment of 'a short-term working group' which would draw on all the existing reports and documents to prepare an 'action blueprint'.

With regard to the future of CLANZ, the manifesto noted that some of its functions would be phased out as locally-based support and resources are extended through the CLPs. It envisaged that CLANZ would be reconstituted as a standing committee of the reformed and strengthened NRC. Its funding 'for seeding grants and project funding to community groups and

organisations and for contributing to the flow of information between communities with which it interacts, and the NRC' would however be increased to \$600,000 over a three-year period. In addition it noted that 'the membership of CLANZ may need to be considered by the working group to ensure adequate representation is maintained'.

One of the early initiatives of the new government was to establish a Tertiary Education Advisory Commission (TEAC) to review all aspects of tertiary education. This Commission published its first report three months later under the title 'Shaping a Shared Vision: Lifelong Learning for a Knowledge Society' (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2000). The breadth of the government's thinking about the nature and scope of tertiary education was signalled in the preamble to the Commission's terms of reference which state that: Education provided by tertiary education providers, businesses, and community groups is vitally important to New Zealand in building a true knowledge society and achieving the economic benefits for such a society (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2000 p. 32).

Clearly ACE was seen by government as an important part of the wider field of tertiary education, and this view was strongly endorsed by the Commission in its first report which concluded that the: ...tertiary education system should be broadly defined to encompass all formal and non-formal learning outside the school system (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2000 p. 10). Between July and December 2000 the Commission invited and considered submissions and in February 2001 published its second report under the title 'Shaping the System' (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2001b). This was followed in August 2001 by a third report entitled 'Shaping the Strategy' (Tertiary Education Advisory Commission, 2001a). In the meantime, in August/September 2000, the government appointed several working groups to examine specific aspects of tertiary education. Thus, a group of officials undertook a review of industry training and an Adult Education and Community Learning Working Party was established. Over the ensuing months this Working Party invited and received a large number of

submissions. In addition, discussions were held with a wide range of people and organisations.

In July 2001 its report (Adult Education & Community Learning Working Party, 2001) was published. As I have noted elsewhere (Tobias, 2002), this report addresses a wide range of issues and concerns faced by those involved in ACE following a decade or more which had been characterised by: (a) an almost complete lack of interest on the part of successive governments; (b) a lack of a policy framework within which ACE might be located and hence a lack of recognition and support by policy analysts and key people in the Ministry of Education; and (c) serious underfunding of many voluntary organisations and groups working in ACE.

The report highlights the roles of ACE in providing education for those with the greatest need, contributing to the strengthening of civil society, and identifying new national educational needs. It identifies and discusses five sets of goals and recommendations which it sees as essential to a revitalised ACE sector. These focus on: (a) the statutory recognition of the ACE sector; (b) the establishment of effective structures and processes to meet the educational needs of communities; (c) the role of the sector in Maori development & the central place which should be given to establishing an educational framework based on Te Tiriti o Waitangi; (d) the need for ACE to have secure, flexible, equitable and transparent funding; and (e) the need to strengthen the capacity of the ACE sector through research, professional development and more effective information for guidance and referral.

As far as CLANZ is concerned, it is relevant to note the working party's recommendation that a statutory ACE Board (which should be Tiriti-based and comprise up to nine people 'representative of sectoral interests') should be established (either as a stand-alone body or as an advisory committee of TEC) to provide policy and research advice, funding advice, promote good practice, facilitate professional development opportunities, foster innovation, and provide field support to the networks, locally and nationally (p 21).

It is also relevant to note the emphasis placed by the working party on the important role to be played by Local ACE Networks in ensuring that the most effective use is made of limited resources, as well as its view that the goal of gaining secure, flexible, equitable and transparent funding for ACE could best be achieved by establishing 'a single funding pool' (p. 39) by drawing together all public funds which currently derive from various sources and which are currently distributed by 'a confusing array of .. mechanisms' (p. 38).

Within this new framework, it seems, there was no place for CLANZ. The working party stated that 'establishing a sound national and local infrastructure will be vital for progress in the ACE sector. This means providing adequate funding for the ACE Board and the establishment of ACE Networks. The ACE Board will play a pivotal role in the ACE sector. It will subsume the functions of the NRC and CLANZ and be funded for a far greater level of activity (as described in Goal 1). Funding should be on a triennial basis through the Ministry of Education with accountability to the Ministry. Funding should cover personnel, administration, policy development and advice, approval of charters and strategic plans, supporting local networks and research grants' (p 46).

The working party recommended that the funding of 'non-chartered ACE organisations' - the community groups and organisations currently funded by CLANZ as well as through the tutor-hours provided by schools - should be through 'an informal contractual arrangement with a chartered organisation' (p 44). 'Secondly, funding for emerging needs' should be provided by the ACE Board. This fund should support 'emerging education organisations that have never accessed community education funding' (p 45). It 'should replace the existing CLANZ function and should be used to develop the infrastructure necessary to run community education programmes, or to fund new community education initiatives' (p 45). Thirdly, having noted that 'one of the hallmarks of a revitalised ACE sector should be innovation at all levels' (p 45), the working party recommended the establishment of an Innovation and Development Fund. This fund, to be promoted nationally through ACE Networks and by the National ACE Board, was to be available for projects that

fitted national ACE goals and strategies. These included national projects, such as conferences or adult learners' week and demonstration projects which might trial new opportunities for learners, or new methods of promoting or evaluating ACE programmes.

In 2002 the Education (Tertiary Reform) Amendment Act was passed. This legislation was based on the work done by the TEAC and as such promoted a wide range of changes in the field of tertiary education. The Act established the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) Te Amorangi Matauranga Matua, as a key instrument of government policy responsible to the Minister of Education (Tertiary). In terms of the legislation, the TEC is responsible for funding all post-compulsory education and training offered by universities, polytechnics, colleges of education, wānanga, private training establishments, foundation education agencies, industry training organisations and adult and community education providers. One of the key roles of TEC has been to oversee the implementation of the Tertiary Education Strategy and its associated set of priorities.

In the meantime within the field of ACE itself the government was also active. The recommendations of the working party were largely accepted by government, and the report has played a key role in guiding many of the developments in ACE since it was published. In line with the report's recommendations, a new Innovation and Development Fund was set up in 2002 to encourage and support flexibility and responsiveness in ACE at local levels. Administered by the TEC, this fund provides for one-off funding of up to \$10,000. Secondly, Local ACE Pilot Networks were established in 2002, and since then TEC has continued to support the establishment of Local ACE Networks around the country. Thirdly, in 2003 an ACE Reference Group was established to advise TEC on ACE issues. Fourthly, in 2004 government announced the establishment of an ACE New Provider Fund, to be administered by the TEC to build the capability of existing ACE providers that are performing well in the ACE priority areas, and have not previously been funded through Vote Education, as well as the provision of additional funding to be administered by the TEC to assist ACE providers to meet the new ACE

quality assurance requirements. Fifthly, over the past year considerable work has been done by TEC, leading to the recent publication of a consultation document on the proposed new funding framework for ACE (Tertiary Education Commission Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua, 2005). In the meantime other funding mechanisms and processes, including those of CLANZ, have continued to function with the support of the TEC.

Elsewhere I have undertaken a general critique of this document and I do not propose to repeat this here (Tobias, 2005). In general the document is based on the recommendations contained in the report of the ACE working party. It seeks to elaborate and expand on proposals contained in this report, and it therefore comes as no surprise to read that the future of CLANZ is still insecure. The document notes that current 'expectations are that the CLANZ fund will eventually merge into the Funding Framework to become part of the reserved allocation for funding small providers'. However it also notes the role of CLANZ in allocating small grants to community groups, and points out that although the TEC administers the CLANZ grants process, the CLANZ Committee, which is comprised of sector representatives, makes funding decisions.

The document goes on to state that the TEC is committed to ensuring that small community providers continue to have access to government funding. In doing this however it is also 'conscious of the need to minimise compliance costs to these providers, while at the same time ensuring that programme provision contributes to the ACE priorities and meets quality standards'. The document states further that the TEC considers this can be achieved through:

- the establishment of a small provider funding pool. The level of funding allocated to this pool could be calculated on the basis of the current funding available to community groups through schools and community learning centres.
- the identification of 'lead providers' in geographically defined regions. Nominated lead providers would be contracted by the TEC to administer funding to small-scale providers within their region, and to provide them with support to deliver high quality ACE programmes and activities focused on

priority areas. Under this proposal lead providers may be allocated additional funding by the TEC in recognition of the costs associated with undertaking this role.

This then is the solution proposed for the future. Whether or not this proposal will be more effective in distributing small grants in a fair and equitable manner to community groups than the more centralised CLANZ mechanism must remain an open question. It could be argued that both have their strengths and limitations and to some extent the answer must lie in the amount of money available. In general however it does seem that we may still have some way to go before we can set in place decision-making mechanisms and structures which will reflect the richness and diversity of those involved in ACE both nationally and locally.

#### **4.0 THE NUMBER & VALUE OF APPLICATIONS & GRANTS**

##### **4.1 Number & value of applications & grants**

This section provides an overview of the number and value of applications received and grants approved by CLANZ annually over the entire period from 1984 to 2004. A total of 5,212 applications (at an average of 326 per annum) were received by CLANZ over the sixteen-year period. Of these, a total of 2,917 grants (at an average of 182 per annum) were approved at an average (mean) value of \$1,255 per grant.

Table 1 presents a summary of the number and value of applications received and grants awarded each year over the period, together with the average value of the grants approved each year.

**Table 1**  
**Number of applications and grants, & their total & average values each year,**  
**1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Number of applications received</b>	<b>Total value of applications received</b>	<b>Total number of grants awarded</b>	<b>Total value of grants awarded</b>	<b>Mean/Ave value of grants approved</b>
1989	813	\$4,598,311	332	\$497,645	\$1,499

1990	443	\$1,537,719	204	\$326,043	\$1,598
1991	429	\$1,434,681	218	\$308,132	\$1,413
1992	282	\$779,194	174	\$198,318	\$1,140
1993	263	\$872,039	140	\$203,417	\$1,453
1994	315	\$906,233	200	\$251,669	\$1,258
1995	220	\$658,392	148	\$155,367	\$1,050
1996	289	\$727,665	205	\$223,120	\$1,088
1997	341	\$920,908	192	\$201,759	\$1,051
1998	361	\$988,187	215	\$191,364	\$890
1999	319	\$741,563	190	\$200,766	\$1,057
2000	341	\$775,272	172	\$187,727	\$1,091
2001	270	\$659,434	152	\$194,226	\$1,278
2002	225	\$551,738	147	\$184,297	\$1,254
2003	152	\$257,561	102	\$146,356	\$1,435
2004	149	\$393,854	126	\$191,109	\$1,517
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,212</b>	<b>\$16,802,750</b>	<b>2,917</b>	<b>\$3,661,314</b>	<b>\$1,255</b>

Both the number and value of funding applications per annum have fallen over the years. Most of this fall took place over the first four years between 1989 and 1992. In 1989 - the first year of CLANZ's existence when little was understood by applicants of its nature, purpose and scope - CLANZ received 813 applications worth a total of \$4,598,311. By 1990 the number of applications had fallen to 443, almost half the 1989 number, and the total value of \$1,537,719 was almost a third of the 1989 value. The number and total value of applications continued to fall over the following couple of years, down to 282 applications worth \$779,194 in 1992.

Thereafter, between 1993 and 2002, the number of applications varied from lows of 221 in 1995 and 225 in 2002 to highs of 361 in 1998 and 341 in 1997 and 2000, while over the same ten-year period their value ranged between lows in the \$500,000s in 2002 and \$600,000s in 1995 & 2001 to highs in the \$900,000s in 1994, 1997 and 1998. It was only in very recent times that the number and value of applications fell away dramatically to new lows of 152 applications worth \$257,561 in 2003, and 149 applications worth \$393,854 in 2004. Whereas, over the first three years from 1989 to 1991, an average of 526 applications worth \$2,523,570 were received each year, over the following period from 1992 to 2002 an average of 294 applications worth \$780,057 were received each year. Thereafter, in 2003 and 2004 the number



and value of applications fell away dramatically to an average of 151 applications worth \$325,707 each year.

Trends in the number and value of grants awarded by CLANZ were similar to those described above. However, variations in grants were not as great as for applications, since, as we have seen above, the annual value of grants was determined by the level of funding provided to CLANZ by government. From 1992 this grant to CLANZ was set at \$200,000 per annum.

In 1989 332 grants at a total value of \$497,645 were awarded. In 1990 this fell to 204 grants at a value of \$326,043, and in 1991 the respective figures were 218 and \$308,132. The average number of grants made annually over this three-year period was therefore 251 worth a total of \$377,273 each year. Thereafter, between 1992 and 2002, the number of grants varied from lows of 141 (worth a total of \$203,417) in 1993 and 148 (worth \$155,367) in 1995, to highs of 200 (worth \$251,669) in 1994, 205 (worth \$223,120) in 1996 and 215 (worth \$191,364) in 1998. Over this eleven-year period an average of 176 grants worth an average of \$199,275 were awarded annually. In 2003 and 2004 the picture changed. Although the total value of grants awarded (\$146,356 and \$191,109) annually was not much lower than in some previous years, the average value of \$168,732 was very much lower than in previous years. Moreover, the number of grants fell away dramatically to 102 and 126 respectively, at an average of 114 grants annually, about two-thirds of the previous average.

Table 2 provides a somewhat different perspective on the value of grants awarded by CLANZ each year over the period. It provides a picture of the distribution by value of the grants made annually by CLANZ. Overall, the values of all grants made over the period were as follows:

- 579, or 20% of all grants were for \$500 or less;
- 994 or 34% of grants were for amounts between \$501 and \$1000;
- 717 or 25% of grants were for amounts between \$1001 to \$1500;
- 332 or 11% were \$1501 to \$2000; and
- 295 or 10% were for amounts over \$2000.

**Table 2**  
**Percentage of grants of different values made annually,**  
**1989-2004**

	<b>\$500 or less</b>	<b>\$501 to \$1000</b>	<b>\$1001 to \$1500</b>	<b>\$1501 to \$2000</b>	<b>Over \$2000</b>
1989	30%	28%	14%	9%	18%
1990	23%	29%	24%	7%	17%
1991	23%	32%	26%	6%	12%
1992	26%	37%	23%	8%	6%
1993	11%	32%	31%	11%	14%
1994	14%	37%	21%	16%	13%
1995	22%	41%	25%	7%	5%
1996	15%	42%	29%	10%	5%
1997	19%	42%	26%	8%	6%
1998	33%	39%	17%	9%	3%
1999	23%	38%	23%	9%	7%
2000	17%	42%	23%	12%	5%
2001	11%	34%	35%	14%	7%
2002	11%	23%	33%	22%	12%
2003	12%	20%	33%	25%	10%
2004	6%	21%	33%	24%	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>

It would seem that the size of grants varied over the period. The proportion of small grants (\$500 or less) was lowest in 1993 (15 or 11%), 1994 (28 or 14%), 2001 (16 or 11%), 2002 (16 or 11%), 2003 (12 or 12%) and 2004 (8 or 6%); and highest in 1989 (100 or 30%), 1992 (45 or 26%) and 1998 (70 or 33%).

On the other hand, the proportion of large grants (Over \$2000) was lowest in 1992 (11 or 6%), 1995 (8 or 5%), 1996 (10 or 5%), 1998 (7 or 3%) and 2000 (9 or 5%), and highest in 1989 (61 or 18%), 1990 (36 or 18%), 1993 (20 or 14%), 1994 (25 or 13%), 2002 (17 or 12%), 2003 (10 or 10%) and 2004 (20 or 16%).

Overall, however, in recent years since 2002, it seems that the proportion of smaller grants of \$1000 or less has fallen, while the proportion of larger grants of more than \$1500 has risen.

Not every applicant received the full amount originally requested. In the next section we examine those applications which were declined by CLANZ. Here, however, in Table 3, we present data on the number and proportion of grants made at the value originally requested, at a reduced level, and at a higher

level than originally requested. A total of 1228 or 42% of all grants awarded over the period were for the full amount requested. This compares with a total of 1653 or 57% of all grants awarded for a reduced amount, and 39 or 1% at a higher level than originally requested.

**Table 3**  
**Number & percentage of grants made as proportion of amount originally requested, 1989-2004**

Year	Number of applications granted full amount originally requested	Percentage of applications granted amount originally requested	Number of applications approved for reduced amount	Percentage of applications approved for a reduced amount	Number of applications granted a larger amount than requested	Percentage of applications granted larger amount than requested
1989	164	49%	144	43%	25	8%
1990	112	55%	87	43%	5	2%
1991	80	37%	139	64%	1	0%
1992	67	39%	105	60%	2	1%
1993	55	39%	80	57%	5	4%
1994	74	37%	126	63%	0	0%
1995	39	26%	109	74%	0	0%
1996	71	35%	134	65%	0	0%
1997	67	35%	124	65%	1	1%
1998	60	28%	155	72%	0	0%
1999	67	35%	123	65%	0	0%
2000	68	40%	104	60%	0	0%
2001	84	55%	68	45%	0	0%
2002	71	48%	76	52%	0	0%
2003	58	57%	44	43%	0	0%
2004	91	72%	35	28%	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1228</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>1653</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>1%</b>

1989 & 1990 saw the largest number and highest proportion of grants being made to cover the full amount or more of the sum requested, In those years 49% and 55% were granted the full amount and only 43% and 42% of grants were made at a level lower than the sum requested. In each of the succeeding 10 years from 1991 to 2000, 40% or fewer grants were for the full amount, whereas well over 50% of all grants were made at a reduced level.

In the 4 years from 2001, however, the situation reversed itself again. In most of these years, the highest proportion of grants was made for the full amount requested. In particular in 2004 72% of grants were for the full amount and only 28% at a reduced level. The exception was 2002 when only 48% of grants were made at the level originally requested, and

## 4.2 Number of applications declined & the reasons for these decisions

This section provides information on funds requested by applicants which were not allocated and on the number and proportion of applications declined each year, together with the reasons for their rejection. A total of 2,293 applications, at an average of 143 per annum, were declined. This comprised 44% of all applications over the period. Overall, it seems that the CLANZ budget over the period enabled it to apply only 22% of all the funds applied for by organisations and groups. Seventy-eight percent of all the funds requested by groups, therefore, remained unallocated.

Table 4 summarises information on the funds requested but not allocated and on the number and proportion of applications declined annually by CLANZ over the years.

**Table 4**  
**Funds not allocated, and number and proportion of applications declined annually, 1989-2004**

	Number of applications declined	Proportion of applications declined	Funds requested but not allocated	Funds not allocated as a proportion of total funds requested
1989	480	59%	\$4,100,655	89%
1990	239	54%	\$1,211,676	79%
1991	211	49%	\$1,126,549	79%
1992	107	38%	\$580,876	75%
1993	124	47%	\$668,622	77%
1994	115	36%	\$654,564	72%
1995	72	33%	\$503,025	76%
1996	84	29%	\$504,545	69%
1997	149	44%	\$719,149	78%
1998	146	40%	\$796,823	81%
1999	128	40%	\$540,797	73%
2000	169	50%	\$587,545	76%
2001	118	43%	\$465,208	71%
2002	78	35%	\$367,441	67%
2003	50	33%	\$111,205	43%
2004	23	15%	\$202,745	51%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2293</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>\$13,141,425</b>	<b>78%</b>

In its first three years CLANZ received a number of applications for quite large amounts - far more than the funds available for allocation. This was especially the case in 1989 when 480 applications (or 59% of all applications) worth a

total of \$4.1 million had to be declined. Over the following three years both the number of applications and the amounts requested fell steadily.

If the first three years of applications are excluded from the analysis, the overall picture changes considerably. From 1992 to 2002 a total of 1290 applications, at an average of 117 per annum, were declined. In 1992 CLANZ declined 107 or 38% of all applications, and although the number and proportions rose and fell over the years, in most years they remained more or less similar. An exception was in 2000 when 169 or 50% of applications were declined. In the following year, 2001, 118 or 43% of applications were declined, and in 2002 the comparable figures were 78 and 35% respectively.

As noted previously, the fall in the number of applications continued in 2003 and 2004. Along with this, there was also a substantial fall in the proportion of applications declined to 33% in 2003 and 15% in 2004, and in the funds requested but not allocated to \$111,205 in 2003 and \$202,745 in 2004.

What were the primary factors influencing CLANZ's decisions to decline applications? Did these change over the years? And if so in what ways? Table 5 provides information on trends in the kinds of reasons for these decisions over the period.

**Table 5**  
**Reasons for project applications being declined each year,**  
**1989-2004**

	<b>Outside CLANZ' funding criteria</b>		<b>Low priority for CLANZ funding</b>		<b>Other e.g. insufficient information provided or application withdrawn</b>		<b>Total applications declined</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	273	57%	169	35%	38	8%	481
1990	144	60%	50	21%	45	19%	240
1991	87	41%	88	42%	36	17%	212
1992	68	64%	26	24%	13	12%	108
1993	55	44%	38	31%	31	25%	125
1994	57	50%	42	37%	16	14%	116
1995	28	39%	25	35%	19	26%	73
1996	39	46%	37	44%	8	10%	85
1997	56	38%	57	38%	36	24%	150

1998	46	32%	68	47%	32	22%	147
1999	47	37%	59	46%	22	17%	129
2000	76	45%	63	37%	30	18%	170
2001	75	64%	23	19%	20	17%	119
2002	42	54%	22	28%	14	18%	79
2003	26	52%	16	32%	8	16%	50
2004	10	43%	4	17%	9	39%	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>1093</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>2232</b>

For this purpose the reasons were classified into three broad categories. Firstly, there were those applications which for one reason or another were considered to be outside CLANZ's funding criteria. Applications from commercial organisations, educational institutions and other statutory bodies were in general excluded, as were those from national organisations. As we have seen, CLANZ's focus was essentially on 'community groups' in the voluntary sector. Moreover, not all applications from these groups were seen as being within the criteria. In some of its publicity (see for example the leaflet 'Learn for life...Grants for Adult Learning, CLANZ' in AKINA, No 40, June 1992: p 55) it is stated that CLANZ did not fund: 'ongoing salaries and general administration costs; vehicles and buildings; institutions such as schools and polytechnics; projects mainly for children [or] overseas travel.'

Secondly, there were those applications which were considered to be low priorities in terms of CLANZ funding. The following is stated in the leaflet referred to above: '*We give low priority to:* training for individuals; expensive equipment; groups receiving direct funding from Government; [and] national gatherings and conferences.'

Thirdly, there were those applications which were declined for other reasons, most notably because the information provided in the application form was inadequate. Where possible efforts were made by CLANZ members to make personal contact with applicants. However there are several references in CLANZ's reports in issues of AKIN A over the years, to the failure of some applicants to supply sufficient information especially on their budgets.

The most common reason for the rejection of funding applications was that they were considered to fall outside CLANZ's funding criteria. A total of 1093 were declined on these grounds. The frequency of these reasons, however, varied widely from year to year. As a proportion of all reasons, they varied from highs of 60% in 1990 and 64% in 1992 & 2001 and lows of between 32% and 39% in 1995, 1997, 1998 & 1999. Overall, however, they constituted nearly half (48%) of all the reasons given.

The next most common reason for rejection was that the application was for something which was considered to be low in terms of CLANZ's priorities. A total of 787 applications were declined on these grounds. As a proportion of all reasons, they varied from highs between 42% and 47% in 1991, 1996, 1998 and 1999 to lows of between 19% and 24% in 1990, 1992, 2001 & 2004. Overall, however, they constituted a little over a third (34%) of all the reasons given.

The third set of reasons for rejection was that the applications lacked the required information. A total of 377 applications were declined on these grounds. As a proportion of all reasons, they varied from highs between 24% and 39% in 1993, 1995, 1997 and 2004 to lows of between 8% and 12% in 1989, 1992 & 1994. Overall, however, they constituted 16% of all the reasons given.

Overall, then, throughout most of the period it would seem that the most common set of reasons for declining applications (comprising almost half of all reasons coded) was that they fell outside CLANZ funding criteria. Only in three years – 1997, 1998 & 1999 - were these reasons exceeded by those which placed the application low in priority for CLANZ funding. This latter set of reasons was the second most common (comprising about a third of all those coded). The third set of reasons (which included a very wide range of things such as the provision of insufficient information and the withdrawal of an application) was the third most common set (comprising 16% of all reasons coded). Few significant trends could be identified. Firstly, as we have already seen, in 1989 and to a lesser extent in 1990 a very large number of

applications for projects did not fit CLANZ's criteria. This was to be expected, as prospective applicants - and CLANZ itself - were gaining familiarity with the scope of CLANZ's funding. Secondly, it is worth highlighting the fact that in the most recent year - 2004 - not only were only a small number of applications declined, but also, of those that were declined, as many as 39% were declined for reasons having to do with a lack of information or the withdrawal of applications.

### **4.3 Organisations/groups applying for & receiving grants**

This section examines some questions concerning the number and percentage of organisations making one or more application and receiving one or more grants.

Table 6 below provides information on the number and percentage of organisations making one or more applications each year as well as overall figures on the number and percentage of organisations making one or more than one application over the 16-year period. In the final column it also provides information on the total number of organisations making applications to CLANZ each year.

The total number of groups and organisations applying each year fell dramatically over the first three or four years of CLANZ's existence, from a high of 743 in 1989 down to 266 in 1992. Thereafter, from 1992 to 1996 the number of organisations applying remained in the 200s. In 1997 the number rose to 312 and remained at about that level for the next few years until it fell back to 252 in 2001 and 207 in 2002. Then in 2003 and 2004 it fell further to 139 and 136 respectively. Overall an average of 298 groups and organisations applied to CLANZ for funds annually.

The overwhelming majority, 93% of all groups and organisations applying to CLANZ, made only one application in any one year, while only 7% made more than one application.

**Table 6**  
**Number & percentage of organisations making one application & more than one applications per annum, 1989-2004**



Years	Organisations making only one application per annum		Organisations making more than one application per annum		Total number of organisations
	N	%	N	%	N
1989	681	92%	62	8%	743
1990	394	96%	16	4%	410
1991	336	93%	27	7%	363
1992	254	95%	12	5%	266
1993	229	93%	17	7%	246
1994	266	92%	23	8%	289
1995	196	94%	12	6%	208
1996	247	93%	19	7%	266
1997	286	92%	26	8%	312
1998	301	92%	25	8%	326
1999	275	94%	19	6%	294
2000	290	93%	23	7%	313
2001	238	94%	14	6%	252
2002	192	93%	15	7%	207
2003	133	96%	6	4%	139
2004	130	96%	6	4%	136
<b>Average</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>298</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4448</b>		<b>322</b>		<b>4770</b>

Table 7 below provides information on the number and percentage of groups and organisations applying successfully and unsuccessfully for funds, as well as those receiving one grant and those receiving more than one. The data enable us to examine the patterns of change over the period.

**Table 7**  
**Number & percentage of organisations receiving one grant & more than one grant per annum from CLANZ, 1989-2004**

Years	Organisations applying but not receiving any grants		Organisations receiving one grant		Organisations receiving more than one grant	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1989	427	57%	299	40%	17	2%
1990	201	49%	204	50%	5	1%
1991	167	46%	185	51%	11	3%
1992	95	36%	166	62%	5	2%
1993	107	43%	134	54%	5	2%
1994	101	35%	180	62%	8	3%
1995	62	30%	141	68%	5	2%
1996	68	26%	190	71%	8	3%
1997	126	40%	183	59%	3	1%
1998	119	37%	196	60%	11	3%
1999	110	37%	179	61%	5	2%
2000	131	42%	176	56%	6	2%
2001	97	38%	154	61%	1	0%
2002	71	34%	131	63%	5	2%
2003	46	33%	99	71%	3	2%
2004	20	15%	122	90%	4	3%

<b>Average</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1948</b>		<b>2739</b>		<b>102</b>	

This Table suggests that an average of 122 (or 41% of all) groups and organisations applied unsuccessfully for funds each year. This compares with an average of 171 (or 57%) applying successfully for one grant and 6 (or 2%) for more than one. There were some annual variations. For example, the largest number and highest proportions of groups and organisations not receiving grants were in the early years. In 1989 57% of organisations applying went unrewarded; in 1990 the figure was 49%; and in 1991 it was 46%. In most of the following years the proportions of unrewarded groups and organisations fell below the 40% level. This probably reflects the fact that it took some time for people to learn which kinds of organisations and projects did not meet CLANZ's criteria and priorities. The number and percentage of groups and organisations receiving more than one grant remained small throughout the period but was highest in 1989, 1991 and 1998.

A thorough search through all the groups and organisations receiving grants suggests there were no significant differences between organisations receiving one grant and those receiving more than one. As indicated earlier, in general applications from educational institutions were accorded a low priority, and priority was given to helping local and regional groups rather than national bodies.

Organisations and groups receiving more than one grant included the following (the number of grants awarded are in brackets):

In 1989 the Auckland Unemployed Workers' Rights Centre (3 projects), the Interchurch Commission on Immigration & Refugees, Wellington (2), Link House Agency, Hamilton (2), the Non-Formal Education Forum, Auckland (2), the Northland Association for Mental Health (2), the Peninsula Watchdog, Coromandel (2), Ranui Community Centre (2), Te Aupouri Ngatikahua Te Rarawa Trust, Kaitaia (2) & Te Roopu Whaanui Atawhai, Papakura (2);

in 1990 the National Resource Centre for Adult Education & Community Learning (2), Refugee support Group, Otago (3), New Plymouth Race Relations Group (2), PILLARS, Christchurch (2), New Mothers' Support Group, Johnsonville (2);

in 1991 Peninsula Watchdog, Coromandel (2), Grief Education Trust, Dunedin (2), Women's Centre, Lower Hutt (2), Maori Women's Centre, Hamilton (2), Family Planning Association, Palmerston North (2), Nga Wahine Aroha O Manurewa (2), Te Runanga Otakau, Dunedin (2);

in 1992 Auckland WEA (4), Community Educators' Network Trust, Hamilton (2), Newtown Community Centre, Hamilton (2), Playcentre Area Training Team, Auckland (3), Te Hei O Tahoka, Hamilton (2);

in 1993 Golden Bay Community Workers (2), Women's Refuge, Palmerston North (2), Te Ataarangi, Wellington (2), Te Runanganui O Ngati Kahununu, Hastings (2);

in 1994 Ault Educators Inc, Auckland (3), Canterbury WEA, Christchurch (2), Child Abuse Prevention Society, Auckland (2), NZ Sign Language, Auckland (2), Te Paeroa Waka (2), Reefton Gateway Group (2), Waltham Community Cottage, Christchurch (2);

in 1995 Golden Bay Workcentre Trust, Takaka (2), Parentline, Hawkes Bay (2), Parents Centre, Wellington (2), Te Rangatahi Tuarua Trust, Auckland (2), Womenline Society, Auckland (2);

in 1996 Home & Family Society, Auckland (2), No Limits, Morrinsville (2), Parents Centre, Wellington (4), Budget Advisory Service, Rotorua (2), Te Akoranga Playcentre, Henderson, Auckland (2), Waipareira Community House, Auckland (2), Waitakere WEA, Auckland;

in 1997 Parent to Parent, Porirua (2), Toi Ora Live Art Trust, Auckland (3), Women's Centre, Wanganui(2);

in 1998 Family Support Services, Kaiwaka (2), Home & Family, Christchurch (2), He Waka Matauranga, Auckland (2), Kaitaki Youth Resource Centre, Otorohanga (2), Kapiti Women's Health Collective (2);

in 1999 Glen Innes Adult Literacy Scheme, Auckland (3), Northshore Parents' Centre, Auckland (2), Parentline Manawatu, Palmerston North (2), Wairarapa ARLA, Masterton (2), Wellington North Parents Centre (3);

in 2000 Cleveland Living Arts Centre, Dunedin (2), Kaipatiki Ecological Restoration Project Glenfield/Birkdale (2), Kapiti Women's Health Collective Paraparaumu (2), Manawatu Women's Learning Group, Palmerston North (2), Upper Hutt Women's Centre (2);

in 2001 Alicetown Community Centre, Lower Hutt (3);

in 2002 Kotare Trust, Wellsford (2), Te Pae Pae Meeting House, New Plymouth (3), Thames Women's Centre (2), Rape Crisis Group, Whangarei (2);

in 2003 Homebuilders & Family Help, Maugatautoto/Paparoa (2), Methodist Social Service Centre, Palmerston North (2), Nelson Women's Centre (2); and

in 2004 Destiny Church, Te Kakano Whakapai, Otaki (2), Network Waitangi, Whangarei (2), Palmerston North Women's Refuge (2), Refugee Resettlement Support, Christchurch (2), Upper Hutt Women's Centre (2).

## 5.0 TYPES & SUBJECT AREAS OF PROJECTS & PROGRAMMES

In this section we examine trends and patterns in (1) the types of projects and programmes for which funding was sought and for which grants were made and (2) the programme or subject areas covered by these projects and programmes.

### 5.1 Types of projects & programmes

This section provides information on the kinds of projects for which applications were made to CLANZ and which received funding. Each project or programme was coded by type on the basis of whether its primary focus was to provide 'information', 'education or training', 'networking', or 'other'. Tables 8 and 9 show the distribution of annual applications and grants by type of project.

**Table 8**  
**Number & percentage of applications received annually by CLANZ for various types of projects, 1989-2004**

Years	Information - kits, brochures, etc.		Education & training – courses, workshops, etc.		Networking - hui, meetings, etc.		Other - running costs, buildings, etc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1989	76	9%	533	66%	42	5%	162	20%

1990	36	8%	286	65%	85	19%	36	8%
1991	34	8%	302	71%	57	13%	35	8%
1992	27	10%	217	77%	17	6%	21	7%
1993	15	6%	223	85%	13	5%	12	5%
1994	21	7%	245	78%	24	8%	25	8%
1995	7	3%	205	93%	1	0%	7	3%
1996	9	3%	226	78%	36	12%	18	6%
1997	13	4%	260	76%	46	14%	21	6%
1998	13	4%	297	83%	43	12%	7	2%
1999	4	1%	274	86%	18	6%	23	7%
2000	20	6%	280	82%	19	6%	22	6%
2001	6	2%	216	80%	22	8%	26	10%
2002	12	5%	183	81%	16	7%	14	6%
2003	1	1%	139	91%	5	3%	7	5%
2004	3	2%	136	91%	5	3%	5	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4022</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>8%</b>

Overall, it seems that the overwhelming majority of applications (77%) were coded 'Education & training', and these applications, with 62% being successful, were also more likely to be approved for funding than any of the others. The second largest category of applications (with 9% of all applications) were those coded 'Networking'. Fifty percent of these were approved for funding. Overall the findings for the various types of project were as follows:

- 297 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Information', and of these 97 (or 33%) were successful;
- 4,022 (or 77% of all applications) were coded 'Education & training', and of these 2,495 (or 62%) were successful;
- 449 (or 9% of all applications) were coded 'Networking', and of these 225 (or 50%) were successful; and
- 441 (or 8% of all applications) were coded 'Other', and of these 100 (or 23%) were successful.

**Table 9**  
**Number of grants made annually by CLANZ & the percentage these grants constituted of applications for various types of project, 1989-2004**

	Information - kits, brochures, etc		Education & training		Networking - hui, meetings, etc		Other - running costs, buildings, etc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1989	21	28%	274	51%	19	45%	18	11%
1990	15	42%	150	52%	36	42%	3	8%
1991	8	24%	184	61%	22	39%	4	11%
1992	6	22%	158	73%	5	29%	5	24%

1993	3	20%	131	59%	6	46%	0	0%
1994	3	14%	171	70%	14	58%	12	48%
1995	3	43%	141	69%	1	100%	3	43%
1996	6	67%	164	73%	27	75%	8	44%
1997	5	38%	158	61%	29	63%	0	0%
1998	7	54%	180	61%	27	63%	1	14%
1999	2	50%	164	60%	12	67%	12	52%
2000	7	35%	148	53%	9	47%	8	36%
2001	1	17%	137	63%	5	23%	9	35%
2002	6	50%	124	68%	7	44%	10	71%
2003	1	100%	97	70%	1	20%	3	43%
2004	3	100%	114	84%	5	100%	4	80%
Total	97	33%	2495	62%	225	50%	100	23%

As far as trends are concerned, if we look first at the number of applications and grants made over the years, it seems that in both cases there was a fairly steady fall in all types of projects. Firstly, for projects coded 'Information' the number of applications and grants fell from an average of 43 and 13 per annum respectively in 1989-92 to 13 and 5 per annum for 1993-2000, and 6 and 3 per annum for 2000-2004

Secondly, similar falls also took place in each of the other types of project. The number of applications and grants for those coded 'Education & training' fell from an annual average of 335 and 192 in 1989-1992 to 251 and 157 in 1993-2000 and 169 and 118 in 2000-2004. For those coded 'Networking' the annual average fell from 50 applications and 21 grants in 1989-1992 to 25 and 16 in 1993-2000 and 16 and 5 in 2000-2004. Finally, the number of applications and grants for those coded 'Other' fell from an annual average of 64 and 8 in 1989-1992 to 17 and 6 in 1993-2000 and 13 and 7 in 2000-2004.

On the other hand, if we look at trends in the proportion of different types of projects, it seems that there were differences over the years in the balance of types of projects applied for and funded. Firstly, concerning projects coded 'Education & training', the proportion of both applications and grants rose fairly steadily over the period from an annual average of 68% of applications and 83% of grants in 1989-1992, to 82% of applications and 86% of grants in 1993-2000, and 85% of applications and 90% of grants for 2001-2004 (with 91% for each of the two most recent years).

Secondly, the proportion of applications for 'Networking' projects fell fairly steadily over the period from an annual average of 10% for 1989-1992 to 8% for 1993-2000 and 6% for 2001-2004 while the proportion of grants remained constant at 9% over the first two periods before falling to 3% in 2001-2004. Thirdly, the proportion of applications for 'Information' projects also fell over the period from an annual average of 9% for 1989-1992 to 4% for 1993-2000 and 3% for 2001-2004, while the proportion of grants fell from 5% in 1989-1992 before falling to 2% since then. Finally, the proportion of applications for 'Other' projects also fell over the period from an annual average of 13% for 1989-1992 to 6% for 1993-2000 and 7% for 2001-2004 (and 4% for the two most recent years). On the other hand the proportion of grants remained constant at 3% in the first two periods before rising to 5% in 2001-2004.

## **5.2 Subject areas of projects**

This section examines the distribution across subject areas or fields of interest of programmes and projects for which applications were made to CLANZ as well as those which received funding. It also examines trends in this distribution over the years. Each application was coded on the basis of its primary subject area or field of interest.

Table 10 below provides information on the number and percentage of applications and grants made in each of twelve subject areas over the entire period, and the following tables in this section of the report provide more detailed information on project funding in each of the subject areas.

Twenty-eight percent of all applications and grants were for community education & development projects or programmes. Family support education programmes were the next most frequently identified, with 20% of all applications and 21% of all grants in this subject area. This was followed by programmes addressing Maori language and culture, comprising 11% of all applications and 13% of grants; health education with 9% of applications and 8% of grants; women's programmes with 7% of applications and 9% of grants; and literacy programmes with 6% of applications and 5% of grants.

Only a relatively small proportion of all programmes and projects addressed topics in the remaining areas. Programmes addressing bi-cultural or race relations issues comprised 3% of all applications and 4% of grants, and Special needs programmes constituted 3% of all applications and grants. These were followed by New Settlers' programmes with 2% of applications and 3% of grants, and programmes addressing Pacific language and culture which comprised 2% of all applications and grants. Finally, programmes in the field of Justice and prison education comprised only 1% of applications and grants.

**Table 10**  
**Number & percentage of applications and grants in various programme areas, 1989-2004**

<b>Programme areas</b>	<b>Applications for funding</b>		<b>Grants</b>		<b>Proportion of successful applications</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Community Education	1475	28%	824	28%	56%
Family support	1054	20%	602	21%	57%
Health	470	9%	221	8%	47%
Bicultural, race relations & Treaty	173	3%	117	4%	68%
Literacy	295	6%	151	5%	51%
Maori Language & Culture	588	11%	366	13%	62%
New Settlers	130	2%	85	3%	65%
Special needs	185	4%	92	3%	50%
Women's issues	383	7%	272	9%	71%
Pacific Languages & Culture	96	2%	53	2%	55%
Justice & Prison Education	53	1%	26	1%	49%
Other	309	6%	108	4%	35%



<b>Total</b>	<b>5211</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2917</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>56%</b>
--------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

### 5.2.1 Community education and development

Table 11 provides year-by-year information on community education and development programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a local Citizens' Advice Bureau to buy a copy of the Social Securities Act;
- a Community Resource Centre to help in running a Communications Workshop for the community;
- a rural Community Activities group to provide community education classes;
- a rural Workcentre Trust to provide community art classes;
- a Family Centre to provide tutor fees for the Elderly Programme;
- a local volunteering organisation to assist with the volunteer training programme;
- a local Embroidery Guild to run a Stitches By the Sea weekend to share and improve embroidery techniques;
- a Maori craft cooperative to provide a series of wananga in community development;
- a co-operative to provide tutor costs and a venue for an adult education weekend for adult education tutors;
- a Maori horticultural group to run workshops in organic gardening;
- a Community Arts group to provide tutor costs only for an art and craft skills exchange programme;
- a Community House Society to assist in running community education classes;
- a marae committee to upskill members and learn how to keep books and basic administration skills for the running of the meeting house and marae;
- a 'Growing through Grief' group to help to train volunteers;
- an Arts Trust to provide two 'life skills' courses;
- a Lifeline group to provide training for volunteers;

- a SeniorNet group to help with expenses for running computer learning programmes;
- a local WEA to help in running a number of courses;
- a local Workcentre Trust to help with expenses for community art courses;
- a church group to help in running weekend course in Art & Culture covering harakeke, clay, fabric & paint;
- a local trust to help with costs of 'ecofootprint' workshops;
- a community association to help to provide community class; and
- an urban & rural mission to provide a community development course.

**Table 11**  
**Applications & grants for programmes and projects in community education & development, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	277	34%	99	30%	36%
1990	60	14%	27	13%	45%
1991	117	27%	59	27%	50%
1992	80	28%	50	29%	63%
1993	102	39%	60	43%	59%
1994	91	29%	58	29%	64%
1995	94	43%	64	43%	68%
1996	73	25%	53	26%	73%
1997	102	30%	55	29%	54%
1998	141	39%	87	40%	62%
1999	112	35%	69	36%	62%
2000	54	16%	32	19%	59%
2001	36	13%	11	7%	31%
2002	22	10%	17	12%	77%
2003	61	40%	40	39%	66%
2004	53	36%	43	34%	81%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1475</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>824</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>56%</b>

Applications for funding for community education and development project and programmes varied in number each year from lows of 22 (in 2002) and 36 (in 2001) to highs of 141 (in 1998) and 277 (in 1989). Proportionately, they varied between lows of 10% (in 2002) & 13% (in 2001) and highs of 43% (in 1995) and 40% (in 2003) of all applications in those years. Overall, applications in community education and development totalled 1,475 over the

entire period, or 28% of all applications received by CLANZ, at an average of 92 applications per annum.

The number and percentage of grants for community education projects and programmes also varied from 11 (or 7% of all grants) in 2001 to 64 (or 43% of grants) in 1995, 87 (40% of grants) in 1998 and 99 (30% of grants) in 1989. Overall, grants were made for a total of 824 community education projects at an average of 52 per annum. This comprised 28% of all grants, and 56% of successful applications received for projects in this field.

Finally the proportion of applications that were successful varied between lows of 36% in 1989 & 31% in 2001 and highs of 73% in 1995, 77% in 2002 & 81% in 2004. Overall 56% of all applications in this field succeeded and it seems that the rate of success of community education & development project applications grew fairly steadily over the years.

### **5.2.2 Family support education**

Table 12 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for family support education programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a rural parenting organisation to supply handbooks for a 'Hot Tips For Parents' seminar;
- a local parenting group to provide tutor fees for a Parent Training and Stress Release workshop;
- a Counselling & Education Centre to provide Preventing Domestic Violence workshops;
- a neighbourhood house to assist with running parenting courses;
- a Rape & Sexual Abuse Healing Centre to provide a workshop for parent, caregivers of children who have been sexually abused;
- an urban & rural mission to provide a weekly discussion & support group for mothers;
- a Community Care Trust to provide a programme to support parents with disaffected teenagers;

- 'Mothers Supporting Mothers' to provide support and education to mothers;
- a local Abuse Intervention Project for the facilitation of Crisis Response Training Workshops;
- a Link House Agency to help to provide Communication Skills for Men and Self Esteem for Adults courses;
- an urban Community Centre to provide a tutor for a craft and care programme for young parents;
- a local Child Abuse Prevention Service for increased parental anger change programmes;
- a Community House towards costs of parenting course;
- a Post and Ante-Natal Distress Support to provide library recourses and education support courses;
- a Support Network for Parents & Caregivers of Sexually Abused Children for ongoing external training for volunteer support workers;
- Deaf Association to provide tutor, interpreters and crèche for workshops to assist deaf parents; and
- a local parenting group to provide training for parents of special needs children.

**Table 12**  
**Applications & grants for family support education programmes,**  
**1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	137	17%	80	24%	37%
1990	85	19%	46	23%	31%
1991	67	16%	37	17%	45%
1992	56	20%	33	19%	52%
1993	51	19%	26	19%	38%
1994	77	24%	53	27%	50%
1995	33	15%	22	15%	67%
1996	78	27%	54	26%	50%
1997	74	22%	45	23%	38%
1998	90	25%	53	25%	50%
1999	73	23%	34	18%	50%
2000	84	25%	27	16%	58%
2001	69	26%	41	27%	48%
2002	43	19%	25	17%	65%
2003	18	12%	13	13%	73%

2004	19	13%	13	10%	92%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1054</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>57%</b>

The number of applications for family support education projects and programmes varied each year from lows of 33 (in 1995) to 90 (in 1998), 18 (in 2003) & 19 (in 2004) to highs of 137 (in 1989), 85 (in 1990), 90 (in 1998) & 84 (in 2000). In terms of the proportion of applications for family education programmes to all applications, there were also considerable annual variations from lows of 15% (in 1995) and 12% (in 2003) & 13% (in 2004) to highs of 24% (in 1994), 27% (in 1996), 25% (in 1998 & 2000) & 26% (in 2001). As far as trends are concerned, it seems that in both the first three years (1989-1991) and again in the final three years (2002-4) applications for family education programmes constituted a smaller proportion of all applications than they did in the intervening years. Overall, applications for family support education projects over the entire period totalled 1,017, or 21% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 66 applications per annum.

Turning to look at the number and percentage of grants for family support education projects and programmes, these also varied from year to year: from lows of 22 (or 15%) in 1995, 13 (or 13%) in 2003, 13 (or 10%) & 2004, to highs of 80 (or 24%) in 1989, 53 (or 27%) in 1994, 54 (or 26%) in 1996 and 53 (or 25%) in 1998. As far as trends are concerned it seems that the proportion of grants made for family education projects may have fallen away somewhat towards the end of the period from 2002 to 2004. Overall, grants were made for a total of 602 family education projects and programmes at an average of 38 per annum. This comprised 21% of all grants, and 57% of successful applications received for projects in this field.

Finally, the proportion of successful applications for family education programmes varied from lows of 37% in 1989 & 31% in 1990 to highs of 67% in 1995, 65% in 2002 & 92% in 2004. Overall, 57% of all applications in this field were successful. This compares with the overall success rate for all applications of 56%.

### 5.2.3 Maori language and culture

Table 13 provides year-by-year information on Maori language and cultural programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a Te Ataarangi group to train tutors and support workers in Te Reo Maori;
- a local Maori cultural group to provide two wananga for Maori Community Workers in local Tikanga and Te Reo Maori;
- a rural Māori group to organise a Hui, including a workshop on researching genealogy;
- a group to organise and maintain a Te Reo Maori and Tikanga programme;
- a whanau group to assist in providing wananga in Maori Culture and Protocol;
- a Marae committee to assist language and waiata workshops;
- a whanau group to assist in running a 4 day wananga to identify and preserve uncommon Maori food;
- an urban group to run wananga to inform local people about history and environmental management;
- a rural Community Resource Centre to provide Te Reo, flax weaving and parenting skills courses;
- a Marae committee to run a wananga on local geographical history;
- a Marae committee to run workshops dealing with art forms and architectural changes for marae;
- a Marae committee to run wananga teaching Karakia and their histories;
- a Marae committee to run workshops to protect and maintain the weaving traditions of the iwi; and
- an iwi group to provide tutors and dictionaries for Te Reo Maori and Treaty of Waitangi courses.

**Table 13**  
**Applications & grants for Maori language & cultural programmes,**  
**1989-2004**

	Applications for funding	Grants	Percentage of successful applications
--	--------------------------	--------	---------------------------------------

<b>Years</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
1989	120	15%	58	17%	48%
1990	65	15%	28	14%	43%
1991	43	10%	21	10%	49%
1992	35	12%	20	11%	57%
1993	23	9%	14	10%	61%
1994	35	11%	31	16%	89%
1995	25	11%	21	14%	84%
1996	41	14%	33	16%	80%
1997	42	12%	27	14%	64%
1998	36	10%	19	9%	53%
1999	30	9%	17	9%	57%
2000	21	6%	17	10%	81%
2001	14	5%	14	9%	100%
2002	32	14%	25	17%	78%
2003	12	8%	9	9%	75%
2004	14	9%	12	10%	86%
<b>Total</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>62%</b>

The number of applications for Maori language and cultural projects and programmes varied each year from lows of 14 (in 2001), 12 (in 2003) & 14 (in 2004) to highs of 120 (in 1989) and 65 (in 1990). Proportionately, there were also considerable annual variations from lows of 9% (in 1993 & 1999), 6% (in 2000), 5% (in 2001) 8% (in 2003) & 9% (in 2004). Overall, applications for Maori language and cultural programmes over the entire period totalled 588, or 11% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 37 applications per annum. However, as far as trends are concerned, it seems that both the number and proportion of applications for Maori projects and programmes fell fairly consistently over the entire period, and particularly during the final six years from 1999 to 2004.

The number and percentage of grants for Maori language and cultural projects and programmes also varied from lows of 14 (or 10%) in 1991, 19 (or 9%) in 1998, 17 (or 9%) in 1999, 14 (or 9%) in 2001, 9 (or 9%) in 2003) & 12 (or 10%) in 2004. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that the proportion of grants made for Maori language and cultural projects may have fallen away in most years from 1998. However there were exceptions, notably in 2002 when 17% of all grants were for Maori language and cultural programmes. Overall, grants were made for a total of 366 Maori language and cultural

projects and programmes at an average of 23 per annum. This comprised 13% of all grants, and 62% of successful applications received for projects in this field.

Finally, the proportion of successful applications for Maori language & cultural programmes varied from lows below 50% each year during the period from 1989 to 1991 to highs of 75% or more per annum from 1994-1996 and 2000-2004, with a 100% success rate in 2001. Overall, 62% of all applications in for Maori language & cultural programmes were successful, as compared with an overall success rate for all applications of 56%. However, if the initial three years are excluded, the success rate for the 13-year period from 1992 to 2004 rose to 72%

#### **5.2.4 Health education**

Table 13 provides year-by-year information on health education projects. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a support group to assist in running two seminars on Loss and Grief;
- a local stroke club to pay for self esteem courses for stroke victims;
- a local Head Injury Society to organise support and information meetings;
- a Women's Health Collective to print an information booklet;
- a Local Kidney society to provide training for staff;
- a Rape & Sexual Abuse Centre to run a workshop on rape and sexual abuse from a Maori perspective;
- a rural Age Concern group to organise an 'Older and Bolder' programme;
- a Maori Women's Refuge group to send 3 members to health hui;
- a local Alzheimer's Foundation group to provide tutor costs for an adult education programme;
- a regional Amputee Society to produce a video to assist with the rehabilitation process of persons affected by amputation; and
- a Women's Wellness group to provide a programme for older women.

**Table 14**  
**Applications & grants for health education programmes & projects,**  
**1989-2004**



	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	78	10%	29	9%	37%
1990	70	16%	22	11%	31%
1991	58	14%	26	12%	45%
1992	27	10%	14	8%	52%
1993	16	6%	6	4%	38%
1994	20	6%	10	5%	50%
1995	9	4%	6	4%	67%
1996	14	5%	7	3%	50%
1997	16	5%	6	3%	38%
1998	12	3%	6	3%	50%
1999	12	4%	6	3%	50%
2000	33	10%	19	11%	58%
2001	48	18%	23	15%	48%
2002	34	15%	22	15%	65%
2003	11	7%	8	8%	73%
2004	12	8%	11	9%	92%
<b>Total</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>47%</b>

The number of applications for health education projects and programmes varied each year from lows of 9 (in 1995), 12 (in 1998 & 1999), 11 (in 2003) & 12 (in 2004) to highs of 78 (in 1989), 70 (in 1990), 58 (in 1991) & 48 (in 2001). In terms of the proportions of applications for health education programmes as compared with all applications, there were also considerable annual variations from lows between 3% and 5% each year from 1995 to 1999 and highs of 16% in 1990 & 18% in 2001. Overall, applications for health education programmes over the entire period totalled 470, or 9% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 29 applications per annum. However, as far as trends are concerned, it seems that both the number and proportion of applications for health education projects and programmes were highest in the period from 1989-1992, and then again from 2000 to 2002. In the intervening years and in 2003-4 it seems that the proportion of applications for health education programmes fell away considerably.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for health education projects and programmes, these also varied, from lows of 6 (or 4%) in 1993 & 1995, 7 (or 3%) in 1996, & 6 (or 3%) in 1997, 1998 & 1999,

to highs in the 20s and proportions ranging between 9% & 15% in the 3-year periods from 1989-1991 and from 2000-2002. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that in the early year the number & proportion of grants made for health education projects were relatively high. They fell away in the years from 1993 to 1999, and then rose again for 3 years from 2000-2002 before falling back somewhat in 2003-4. Overall, grants were made for a total of 221 health education projects and programmes at an average of 14 per annum. This constituted 8% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, the number of successful applications for health education programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from lows below 40% in 1989, 1990, 1993 & 1997 to highs of 65% or more per annum in 1995 & in each year of the 3-year period 2002-2004. Overall, 47% of all applications for health education programmes were successful a somewhat lower overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

#### **5.2.5 Women's issues**

Table 15 provides year-by-year information on projects and programmes addressing women's issues. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a Women's Information, Support & Education Group to assist with a programme to support women who have experience domestic violence;
- a Women's Centre to provide personal development and self awareness courses for women;
- a Women's centre to provide a self defence course for Women;
- the Older Women's Network Theatre to assist with costs for a theatre production on issues around aging;
- a Women's Support group to provide tutor fees for courses for women in esteem and confidence building;
- a Women's centre to provide workshops for women on job application skills;
- a Women's Centre to organise a 'Cook for Less' course;

- a Women's Centre to provide computer lessons, a menopause course and a Te Reo Maori and Tikanga course for women; and
- a church-based social action group to provide a self-awareness programme for women.

**Table 15**  
**Applications & grants for projects and programmes addressing women's issues, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	1	0%	0	0%	0%
1990	20	5%	12	6%	60%
1991	52	12%	30	14%	58%
1992	20	7%	15	9%	75%
1993	17	6%	9	6%	53%
1994	17	5%	10	5%	59%
1995	19	9%	15	10%	79%
1996	16	6%	13	6%	81%
1997	35	10%	29	15%	83%
1998	28	8%	22	10%	79%
1999	30	9%	26	14%	87%
2000	46	13%	29	17%	63%
2001	17	6%	12	8%	71%
2002	25	11%	17	12%	68%
2003	19	12%	12	12%	63%
2004	21	14%	21	17%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>71%</b>

The number of applications for projects and programmes coded as addressing women's issues varied each year from lows of 1 (in 1989), 17 (in 1993 & 1994), 16 (in 1996) & 17 (in 2001) to highs of 52 (in 1991), 35 (in 1997), 30 (in 1999) & 46 (in 2000). In terms of the proportions of applications for women's programmes as compared with all applications, there were also considerable annual variations from lows between 0% in 1989, 5% in 1990, 6% in 1993, 5% in 1994, 6% in 1996 & 6% in 2001. Overall, applications for programmes coded as addressing women's issues over the entire period totalled 383, or 7% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 24 applications per annum. However, as far as trends are concerned, it seems that, following a slow start in 1989 & 1990, the number and proportion of applications for projects and programmes addressing issues for women remained fairly constant through much of the period, constituting

between 5% & 9% of all applications in most years. However there were exceptions to this. For example, in 1991 they constituted 12% of all applications, in 1997 they constituted 10% and in 2000 13%. Then in the most recent 3-year period from 2002 to 2004, they constituted 11%, 12% & 14% respectively.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for projects and programmes coded as addressing women's issues, these also varied from year to year. They ranged from lows of 0 in 1989, 12 (or 6%) in 1990, 9 (or 6%) in 1993, 10 (or 5%) in 1994, 13 (or 6%) in 1996 & 12 (or 8%) in 2001, to highs of 30 (or 14%) in 1991, 29 (or 15%) in 1997, 26 (or 14%) in 1998, 29 (or 17%) in 2000 & 21 (or 17%) in 2004. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that the number and proportion of grants for these programmes and projects rose somewhat unevenly over the early and mid-1990s before reaching something of a plateau through much of the period from 1997 to 2004. Overall, grants were made for a total of 272 projects and programmes coded as addressing women's issues, at an average of 17 per annum. This constituted 9% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, looking at the number of successful applications for programmes addressing women's issues as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, this also varied from lows 60% or lower in 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993 & 1994 to highs of 80% or more per annum in 1996, 1997, 1999 & 2004. The trend here is striking with the success rates of applications being higher in the ten years from 1995 than they were in the first six years from 1989-1995. Overall, 71% of all applications for programmes addressing women's issues were successful a considerably higher overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

#### **5.2.6 Literacy**

Table 16 provides year-by-year information on applicant and grants for literacy projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a local literacy group to update an information pamphlet;
- a rural adult reading and learning assistance group to assist elderly with literacy associated with medication;
- an urban Language Project to organise adult literacy classes;
- a SeniorNet group to provide training in basic usage and applications of emailing;
- a Whanau/Family Support Services Trust to provide computer skills support and training;
- an adult education trust to provide a 'Community Economic Literacy' course;
- a small adult reading and learning assistance group to provide funding for reading resources;
- an Adult Reading and Learning Assistance to provide funding for small group spelling and writing courses;
- an ESOL Home Tutor Service group to provide funding for social English classes for adults from non English speaking backgrounds;
- an ARLA-ESOL Home Tutor Service group to provide funds for a New Immigrant Women class to learn English;
- an urban Adult Literacy Scheme to provide funding for an evening adult literacy group
- an Adult Reading and Learning Assistance group to run a basic mathematics course; and
- an ESOL Home Tutor Society to provide a multi-level ESOL language class.

**Table 16**  
**Applications & grants for Literacy projects & programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	37	5%	4	13%	11%
1990	20	5%	11	16%	55%
1991	11	3%	5	17%	45%
1992	9	3%	8	10%	89%
1993	12	5%	5	13%	42%
1994	12	4%	3	8%	25%
1995	10	5%	6	5%	60%
1996	16	6%	10	4%	63%

1997	37	11%	16	5%	43%
1998	30	8%	14	6%	47%
1999	30	9%	21	5%	70%
2000	21	6%	13	17%	62%
2001	17	6%	11	26%	65%
2002	15	7%	11	26%	73%
2003	12	8%	8	8%	67%
2004	6	4%	5	9%	83%
<b>Total</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>51%</b>

The number of applications for literacy projects and programmes varied each year from lows of 11 (in 1991), 9 (in 1992), 12 (in 1993 & 1994), 10 (in 1995), 12 (in 2003) & 6 (in 2004) to highs of 37 (in 1989), 20 (in 1990), 37 (in 1997) & 30 (in 1998 & 1999) & 21 (in 2000). In terms of the proportions of applications for literacy programmes as compared with all applications, there were also considerable annual variations from lows between 3% and 5% each year from 1989 to 1995 and highs between 8% & 11% in 1997, 1998, 1999 & 2003. Overall, applications for literacy programmes over the entire period totalled 295, or 6% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 18 applications per annum. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that the proportion of applications for literacy projects and programmes each year was higher in the period from 1996 to 2004 than it had been from 1989 to 1995. However there is also some indication that the number and proportion of applications for literacy programmes may have decreased in recent years from a high point in the late-1990s.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for literacy projects and programmes, these also varied, from lows of 4 (or 13%) in 1989, 5 (or 13%) in 1993, 3 (or 8%) in 1994, 6 (or 5%) in 1995 & 5 (or 9%) in 2004, to highs ranging from 11 to 21 between 1997 and 2002 and a percentage figure of 26% in 2001 & 2002. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that in the early year the proportion of grants made for literacy projects was relatively high. They fell away in the years from 1993 to 1999, and then rose again for 3 years from 2000-2002 before falling back somewhat in 2003-4. Overall, grants were made for a total of 151 literacy projects and programmes at an average of 9 per annum. This constituted 11% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, the number of successful applications for literacy programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from lows below 50% in 1989, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1997 & 1998 to highs of 60% or more per annum in 1992, 1995, 1996 & in each year of the 6-year period from 1999 to 2004. As far as trends are concerned the data suggest that the success rates in the latter years from 1999 were somewhat higher than in the earlier years. Overall, 51% of all applications for literacy programmes were successful - a somewhat lower overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

### **5.2.7 Bi-cultural, Race relations & Treaty education**

Table 17 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for bi-cultural, race relations and Treaty education programmes and projects. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a rural group for facilitator fees, venue and video costs for Treaty of Waitangi and cultural awareness workshops;
- a Maori Women's Refuge to provide cultural development training for paid and unpaid staff;
- an urban resource centre to help in providing a bicultural workshop for volunteers and community members;
- a group in a small town to help in holding three wananga to learn about land issues;
- a rural Women's Health Collective to provide a cultural education programme 'Actioning the Treaty';
- an OSCAR Network to help in running a Treaty of Waitangi workshop for Board members and staff;
- a community group in a small town for promotion of Maori culture and biculturalism;
- a disabilities group to help to run workshops to promote biculturalism;
- a number of Project Waitangi groups to help with general running costs and toward costs of running workshops;
- an Interchurch group on Immigration and Refugees to help with the costs of attendance at a bicultural course;

- a small town women's centre to help to fund a bicultural seminar;
- a rural group to help to fund a hui for Maori and pakeha on the Treaty of Waitangi; and
- a playcentre association to help to initiate biculturalism workshops in a number of centres.

**Table 17**  
**Applications & grants for Bicultural, Race Relations & Treaty Education Programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	48	6%	32	10%	67%
1990	36	8%	24	12%	67%
1991	14	3%	10	5%	71%
1992	6	2%	5	3%	83%
1993	6	2%	2	1%	33%
1994	12	4%	8	4%	67%
1995	4	2%	3	2%	75%
1996	8	3%	7	3%	88%
1997	5	1%	3	2%	60%
1998	2	1%	1	0%	50%
1999	5	2%	3	2%	60%
2000	6	2%	4	2%	67%
2001	7	3%	4	3%	57%
2002	7	3%	4	3%	57%
2003	2	1%	2	2%	100%
2004	5	3%	5	4%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>68%</b>

The number of applications for projects and programmes addressing bi-cultural, race relations & treaty issues varied each year from lows of 4 (in 1995), 5 (in 1997), 2 (in 1998), 5 (in 1999), 2 (in 1998), 5 (in 1999), 2 (in 2003) & 5 (in 2004) to highs of 48 (in 1989), 36 (in 1990) & 12 (in 1994). In terms of the proportions of applications for these programmes as compared with all applications, there were also annual variations. However these variations were small – between lows of 1%, 2% & 3%, which were common to most years, and highs of 6% in 1989 and 8% in 1990. Overall, applications for bi-cultural, race relations & treaty programmes over the entire period totalled 173, or 3% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 11 applications per annum. As far as trends are concerned, it seems that the number and proportion of applications for projects and programmes in this



area were consistently low with the highest number and proportion of applications being made in the first two years.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for bi-cultural, race relations & treaty projects and programmes, these also varied, from lows of 2 (or 1%) in 1993, 1 (or 0%) in 1998 & 2 (or 2%) in 2003, to highs of 32 (or 10%) in 1989 & 24 (or 12%) in 1990. The trend was clearly downward in the first few years before it stabilised at a fairly low level over much of the period. Overall, grants were made for a total of 117 bi-cultural, race relations & treaty projects and programmes at an average of 7 per annum. This constituted 4% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, the number of successful applications for bi-cultural, race relations & treaty programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from lows below 33% in 1993, 50% in 1998 and 57% in 2001 & 2002 to highs of 70% or more per annum in 1991, 1992, 1995, 1996, 2003 & 2004. The numbers are too small to identify any clear trends over the period. Overall, however, 68% of all applications for bi-cultural, race relations & treaty programmes were successful - a somewhat higher overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

#### **5.2.8 Special needs programmes**

Table 18 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for Special Needs projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- an urban group to provide tutor fees for therapeutic courses for single parents;
- a mental health group to provide funds to support fortnightly access radio show presented by and directed to people with major mental illness;
- a community group to provide funds for an introductory course in NZ Sign Language;

- a community arts group to provide support for a sculpture workshop for visually impaired people;
- a community group to help to provide education programmes for people who have had problems with addiction;
- an urban group to help in running literacy and keep-fit classes for disabled people;
- a community group to help in training volunteers who work with children with special needs;
- a social service group to help with costs of running two workshops to help disabled people to become more self reliant;
- a community group to help to run an art therapy course for intellectually handicapped people;
- a community group to run a basic education programme for disabled people; and
- a community group to run a programme to support fathers of severely disabled children.

**Table 18**  
**Applications & grants for Special Needs Projects & Programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	29	4%	3	1%	10%
1990	11	2%	4	2%	36%
1991	9	2%	6	3%	67%
1992	5	2%	4	2%	80%
1993	11	4%	3	2%	27%
1994	20	6%	11	6%	55%
1995	11	5%	7	5%	64%
1996	11	4%	9	4%	82%
1997	9	3%	3	2%	33%
1998	9	3%	7	3%	78%
1999	6	2%	6	3%	100%
2000	10	3%	5	3%	50%
2001	19	7%	10	7%	53%
2002	7	3%	2	1%	29%
2003	9	6%	3	3%	33%
2004	9	6%	9	7%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>50%</b>

The number and proportion of applications for Special Needs projects and programmes varied somewhat from year to year. They ranged from lows of 5 (or 2%) in 1992 & 6 (or 2%) in 1999 to highs of 29 (or 4%) in 1989, 20 (or 6%) in 1994 & 19 (or 7%) in 2001. However these variations were small - it seems that the number and proportion of applications for projects and programmes in this area were fairly constant over the years. Overall, applications for Special Needs programmes over the entire period totalled 185, or 4% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 12 applications per annum.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for Special Needs projects and programmes, these also varied a little. However variations were not great over the period, ranging from lows of 3 or 1% in 1989, 3 or 2% in 1993 & 1997, 2 or 1% in 2002 and 3 or 3% in 2003, and numbers were too small for any clear trends to be identified. Overall, grants were made for a total of 92 Special Needs projects and programmes at an average of 6 per annum. This constituted 3% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, the number of successful applications for Special Needs programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from lows below 10% in 1989, 27% in 1993 and 29% in 2002 to highs of 80% or more per annum in 1992, 1996, 1999 & 2004. Once again the numbers are too small to identify any clear trends over the period. Overall, however, 50% of all applications for Special Needs programmes were successful - a somewhat lower overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

### **5.2.9 New settlers' projects and programmes**

Table 19 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for New Settlers' projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a community service group to purchase teaching resource materials for new settler courses;

- a community group to provide an ongoing support group for new immigrant and refugee women;
- a community house to provide funds for tutor fees for conversational English for new immigrants;
- an urban language project to provide funds for tutor for sewing classes for refugees and local residents;
- a community ESOL Scheme to fund 'personal presentation' workshops for Somali women;
- a migrant centre to provide funds for a conversational English programme;
- a refugee support group to provide funds for Khmer language support for new settlers;
- an adult literacy scheme to run a reading, writing and spelling group for Samoan women;
- an ESOL group to run an intensive one weekend tutor training course;
- a refugee support group to provide language and parenting programmes for new arrivals;
- a refugee support group to provide language and parenting programmes for Khmer parents;
- a Chinese church group for English classes for the Chinese community; and
- an inter-church group for teaching English to Assyrian refugees.

**Table 19**  
**Applications & grants for New Settlers' Programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	11	1%	6	2%	55%
1990	9	2%	8	4%	89%
1991	9	2%	9	4%	100%
1992	8	3%	8	5%	100%
1993	10	4%	6	4%	60%
1994	9	3%	6	3%	67%
1995	0	0%	0	0%	-
1996	2	1%	2	1%	100%
1997	6	2%	5	3%	83%
1998	4	1%	2	1%	50%
1999	6	2%	3	2%	50%

2000	26	8%	7	4%	27%
2001	12	4%	6	4%	50%
2002	10	4%	9	6%	90%
2003	5	3%	5	5%	100%
2004	3	2%	3	2%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>65%</b>

The number and proportion of applications for New Settlers' projects and programmes varied somewhat from year to year. They ranged from lows of 0 (or 0%) in 1995, 2 (or 1%) in 1996 & 3 (or 2%) in 2004 to a high of 26 (or 8%) in 2000. For the most part variations were small - it seems that the number and proportion of applications for projects and programmes in this area were fairly constant over the years. The only exceptions to this were that in the mid-1990s applications in this area seem to have fallen away completely, whereas in the early-2000s there was a considerable increase. Overall, applications for New Settlers' programmes over the entire period totalled 130, or 2% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 8 applications per annum.

Turning to examine the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for New Settlers' projects and programmes, these also varied. However variations were not great over the period, ranging from lows of 0 (or 0%) in 1995, 2 (or 1%) in 1996 & 2 (or 1%) in 1998 to highs of 8 (or 5%) in 1992 & 9 (or 6%) in 2002. Numbers were, however, too small for any clear trends to be identified. Overall, grants were made for a total of 85 New Settlers' projects and programmes at an average of 5 per annum. This constituted 3% of all grants made by CLANZ over the entire period.

Finally, the number of successful applications for New Settlers' programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from a low of 27% in 2000 to highs of 100% in 1991, 1992, 1996, 2003 & 2004. Once again the numbers are too small to identify any clear trends over the period. Overall, however, 65% of all applications for New Settlers' programmes were successful - a somewhat higher overall success rate than the 56% for all applications.

### 5.2.10 Pacific language & cultural programmes

Table 20 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for Pacific language and cultural projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a Samoan group to provide funds for various cultural programmes and activities for 55-80 year-olds;
- a Tongan group to fund tutor fees for adults' driving classes in the Tongan language;
- Relationship Services to assist in delivering adult education programmes for Pacific Island communities;
- a Cook Island group to fund cultural trip to visit other Cook Island groups;
- a Pacific women's group to help in providing training for Pacific women in consultancy work;
- a Pacific women's group to help fund four Cook Island workshops;
- a WEA to fund a Tongan Learning Project;
- a Pacific Island Education Committee to help to establish Rarotongan Maori Language Programmes;
- a Pacific women's group to enable Pacific women to learn traditional skills;
- a women's group for materials and tutors to teach Pacific Island women crafts;
- a Samoan play group as a seeding grant for the group;
- a Tongan Women's Support Group for materials and expenses for a Tongan arts and crafts workshop; and
- a Niuean women's group to run workshops for Niuean families on parent and family education.

**Table 20**  
**Applications & grants for Pacific Languages & Cultural Programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Proportion of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	40	5%	17	5%	43%
1990	13	3%	7	3%	54%
1991	9	2%	5	2%	56%

1992	8	3%	6	3%	75%
1993	6	2%	4	3%	67%
1994	4	1%	4	2%	100%
1995	2	1%	0	0%	0%
1996	3	1%	3	1%	100%
1997	1	0%	0	0%	0%
1998	0	0%	0	0%	-
1999	0	0%	0	0%	-
2000	3	1%	2	1%	67%
2001	0	0%	0	0%	-
2002	1	0%	1	1%	100%
2003	2	1%	2	2%	100%
2004	4	3%	2	2%	50%
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>55%</b>

The number and proportion of applications for Pacific language & cultural projects and programmes varied somewhat from year to year. For the most part, however, variations were small. The most important change over the period consisted of a steady downward trend in the early years. In 1989 and 1990 CLANZ received 40 and 13 applications respectively, and these comprised 5% and 3% of all applications. Over the following three years applications in this field numbered 9, 8 and 6 respectively. From 1994 onward, the number and proportion of applications for Pacific language & cultural programmes fell away dramatically. Over the 6 years from 1997 to 2002 a total of only 5 applications were received by CLANZ and in three of those years - 1998, 1999 & 2002 no applications were received. In 2003 & 2004 there were some signs that the downward trend might be reversed but the numbers involved were too small to be confident. Overall, applications for programmes & projects in this field over the entire period numbered 96 or 2% of all the applications received by CLANZ, at an annual average of 6 applications per annum. However, if one looks only at the 10-year period from 1995 to 2004 the total number of applications numbered only 16 at an average of 1.6 per annum.

Turning to examine the number and proportion of grants made for projects in this field, a similar picture emerges. The number of successful applications varied from highs of 17 (in 1989) and 7 (in 1990) to lows of 0, 1 & 2 in all but one of the ten years from 1995 to 2004. Since there were so few applications received over these years, few applications were turned down. Overall, over

the entire period, grants were made for a total of 53 Pacific language & cultural projects and programmes at an average of 3 per annum. This comprised 2% of all grants. However if one excludes the early years & includes only the ten-year period from 1995 to 2004, only ten grants were made for projects in this field, at an average of 1 per annum.

Finally, the number of successful applications for Pacific language & cultural programmes as a percentage of all applications in this programme area, varied from a lows below 60% in 1989, 1990, 1991, 1995, 1997 & 2004 and highs of 100% in 1994, 1996, 2002 & 2003. Once again the numbers are too small to identify any clear trends over the period. However only a very small number of applications were declined over the ten-year period from 1995. Overall, 55% of all applications for New Settlers' programmes were successful – about the same as the overall success rate of 56% for all applications.

#### **5.2.11 Justice & prison education**

Table 21 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for justice and prison education projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a living arts group to pay costs associated with providing creative workshops for prison inmates;
- a community group involved with rehabilitation of offenders to run anger management courses;
- a Prisoner's Aid and Rehabilitation group to fund weaving courses;
- a community group to arrange two workshops for prisoners' families;
- a community group to provide an educative programme for driving offenders;
- a community group for the development of a resource pool and a network of volunteers;
- a community group for a weekend learning experience for women recently released from prison;
- a PILLARS group for airtime costs for the PILLARS radio programme;
- Te Runanga O Waitana & Na Waka Iwi Authority Inc to train law centre volunteers and run courses on legal processes;



- a PILLARS group to run two workshops on building self esteem and co-dependency for people in addictive relationships; and
- a Branch of Maori Wardens to provide training for wardens in Tikanga Maori, Maori protocol and counselling.

**Table 21**  
**Applications & grants for Justice & Prison Education Programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	7	1%	4	1%	57%
1990	12	3%	3	1%	25%
1991	4	1%	3	1%	75%
1992	7	2%	5	3%	71%
1993	3	1%	2	1%	67%
1994	3	1%	1	1%	33%
1995	4	2%	3	2%	75%
1996	1	0%	1	0%	100%
1997	2	1%	2	1%	100%
1998	0	0%	0	0%	-
1999	1	0%	1	1%	100%
2000	3	1%	1	1%	33%
2001	1	0%	0	0%	0%
2002	5	2%	0	0%	0%
2003	0	0%	0	0%	-
2004	0	0%	0	0%	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>49%</b>

The number and proportion of applications for Justice & prison education projects and programmes varied over the years, from lows in 1998, 2003 & 2004 when no applications were received for programmes in this field, to highs in 1989, 1990 and 1992 when 7, 12 & 7 applications were received. Overall it seems that here again there was a general downward trend over the years - a trend which may have been arrested in the early 2000s, with 3 applications being received in 2000 and 5 in 2002. The numbers are too small to be certain. Overall, applications for Justice & Prison Education programmes & projects over the entire period numbered 53 or 1% of all the applications received by CLANZ.

Turning to examine the number and proportion of grants made for justice & prison education projects and programmes, it seems that there is a similar

trend here to that described above. Nearly all the grants in this field were made in the early years, with highs of between 3 and 5 grants each year in the years from 1989 to 1992. By way of contrast, only two grants in this field were awarded in the seven years from 1998 to 2004. There is no sign here that the downward trend in grants awarded has been arrested. Overall, over the entire period, a total of 26 grants were made for justice & prison education projects and programmes, at an average of 1.6 grants per annum. This constituted 1% of all grants, and 49% of all applications received for projects and programmes in this field.

#### **5.2.10 Other unclassified projects & programmes**

Table 22 provides year-by-year information on applications and grants for other unclassified projects and programmes. The following are examples of applications in this field:

- a rural conservation and garden group to provide funds to help to teach adults about New Zealand native fauna;
- a permaculture group to assist in the development and production of a manual to support learning of organic gardening and permaculture;
- a SeniorNet group to assist with funds required for establishment of the group;
- a SeniorNet group to assist with computer tutorial costs;
- a rural Embroiderers Guild to contribute to costs for four visiting tutors for special "Stitches by the Sea" event;
- a Disability Information Centre to contribute costs for "Through Other Eyes" education programme.;
- a WEA group to help cover the costs of a creative writing workshop;
- a community centre to provide tutors for the craft group;
- a Budget Advisory Service to develop and present a budgeting education programme for the community; and
- a Workcentre Trust to help with providing a course "The Funky & The Fabulous - A Journey from Fabric to Fibre".

**Table 22**  
**Applications & grants for other unclassified projects & programmes, 1989-2004**

	Applications for funding		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
Years	N	%	N	%	%
1989	28	3%	0	0%	0%
1990	42	9%	11	5%	26%
1991	35	8%	7	3%	20%
1992	21	7%	6	3%	29%
1993	6	2%	3	2%	50%
1994	15	5%	5	3%	33%
1995	9	4%	2	1%	22%
1996	26	9%	13	6%	50%
1997	11	3%	1	1%	9%
1998	8	2%	4	2%	50%
1999	14	4%	4	2%	29%
2000	34	10%	16	9%	47%
2001	30	11%	20	13%	67%
2002	24	11%	14	10%	58%
2003	3	2%	0	0%	0%
2004	3	2%	2	2%	67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>35%</b>

The number of applications for projects and programmes which could not be classified in any of the above fields or subject areas varied widely from year to year. They varied from lows of 6 (in 1993) & 3 (in 2003 & 2004) to highs in the 30s and 40s in 1990 & 1991 and again in 2000 & 2001. As a percentage of all applications received, applications for projects and programmes which could not be classified have also varied from lows of 2% (in 1993, 1998, 2003 & 2004) and 3% (in 1989 & 1997) to highs of 10% (in 2000) and 11% (in 2001 & 2002). Overall, over the entire period applications for programmes & projects which could not be classified, numbered 309 or 6% of all the applications received by CLANZ.

Turning to examine the number and proportion of grants made for projects and programmes which could not be classified in any of the above programme areas, these varied in number from highs of 11 (in 1990), 13 (in 1996), 16 (in 2000), 20 (in 2001) & 14 (in 2002) to lows of 0 (in 1989), 1 (in 1997) & 0 (in 2003). In terms of the proportion of grants to all applications, the variation was from lows of 0% (in 1989 & 2003) & to highs of 9% (in 2000), 13% (in 2001) and 10% (in 2002). Overall, over the entire period, grants were made for a total of 108 unclassified projects and programmes, at an average

of 7 grants per annum. This comprised 4% of all successful applications, and 35% of all applications received for unclassified projects and programmes – a rate of success considerably below the 56% success rate for all applications over the entire period.

## **6.0 GENDER, ETHNICITY & AGE PROFILES OF SUCCESSFUL & UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS**

### **6.1 Gender**

This section examines the question whether women or men were more likely to have benefited from CLANZ funding. Table 23 below provides information on the overall number and percentage of funding applications received for projects for women only, men only and for women and men. It also provides annual numbers and percentages. There is little evidence of any changes over the years, although there is some evidence to suggest that there were more programmes for women in the early years from 1989 to 1995 and again in the later years from 2000 to 2004. The overwhelming majority of all applications (78%) were for projects which were not explicitly gendered. Only 2% were explicitly intended for men while 20% were explicitly for women.

**Table 23**  
**Number & percentage of applications received by CLANZ, by gender, 1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Women only</b>		<b>Men only</b>		<b>Both men &amp; women</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	151	19%	10	1%	651	80%	812
1990	109	25%	15	3%	318	72%	443
1991	111	26%	9	2%	308	72%	428
1992	69	24%	6	2%	207	73%	282
1993	56	21%	7	3%	200	76%	263
1994	66	21%	21	7%	228	72%	315
1995	49	22%	8	4%	163	74%	220
1996	32	11%	5	2%	252	87%	289
1997	51	15%	8	2%	281	83%	340
1998	42	12%	4	1%	314	87%	360
1999	54	17%	6	2%	259	81%	319
2000	78	23%	5	1%	258	76%	341
2001	60	22%	10	4%	200	74%	270
2002	54	24%	2	1%	169	75%	225
2003	30	20%	3	2%	119	78%	152
2004	35	23%	3	2%	111	74%	149
<b>Overall average</b>		<b>20%</b>		<b>2%</b>		<b>78%</b>	

<b>Total</b>	<b>1047</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>4038</b>	<b>5208</b>
--------------	-------------	------------	-------------	-------------

Table 24 below provides information on the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for projects for women only, men only and for women and men over the years. The picture is similar to that for funding applications as presented in the previous Table. Once again there is little evidence of major changes in the distribution of grants on the basis of gender, though the number of grants in all categories fell steadily throughout the period. The overwhelming majority of all grants (75%) were for projects which were not explicitly gendered. Only 2% were explicitly intended for men, while 23% were explicitly for women.

**Table 24**  
**Number & percentage of grants made by CLANZ, by gender,**  
**1989-2004**

	<b>Women only</b>		<b>Men only</b>		<b>Both men &amp; women</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	84	25%	6	2%	242	73%	333
1990	60	29%	4	2%	140	69%	205
1991	58	27%	6	3%	154	71%	219
1992	46	26%	4	2%	124	71%	175
1993	31	22%	5	4%	104	74%	141
1994	44	22%	13	7%	143	72%	201
1995	35	24%	5	3%	108	73%	149
1996	25	12%	4	2%	176	86%	206
1997	38	20%	4	2%	150	78%	193
1998	31	14%	2	1%	182	85%	216
1999	44	23%	2	1%	144	76%	191
2000	48	28%	4	2%	120	70%	173
2001	35	23%	4	3%	113	74%	153
2002	38	26%	1	1%	108	73%	148
2003	20	20%	3	3%	79	77%	103
2004	33	26%	2	2%	91	72%	127
<b>Overall percentage</b>	-	<b>23%</b>	-	<b>2%</b>	-	<b>75%</b>	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>670</b>		<b>69</b>		<b>2178</b>		<b>2917</b>

The data presented in Table 25 below enables us to examine whether there were any gendered differences in the percentage of applications which were successful or unsuccessful. The data suggest that there were considerable variations from year to year. For example, in 5 of the 14 years (1989, 1991, 1993, 1996 & 2000) a slightly higher proportion of applications for men's projects than women's were successful, whereas in one year (1992) the

proportions were the same. In the other eight years a very much higher proportion of women's projects were successful.

**Table 25**  
**Grants or successful applications awarded as a percentage of all applications received**  
**By gender, 1989-2004**

Years	Women only	Men only	Both men & women	Overall annual average	N
1989	56%	60%	37%	41%	332
1990	55%	27%	44%	46%	204
1991	52%	67%	50%	51%	218
1992	67%	67%	60%	62%	174
1993	55%	71%	52%	53%	140
1994	67%	62%	63%	63%	200
1995	71%	63%	66%	67%	148
1996	78%	80%	70%	71%	205
1997	75%	50%	53%	56%	192
1998	74%	50%	58%	60%	215
1999	81%	33%	56%	60%	190
2000	62%	80%	47%	50%	172
2001	58%	40%	57%	56%	152
2002	70%	50%	64%	65%	147
2003	67%	100%	66%	67%	102
2004	94%	67%	82%	85%	126
<b>Overall average</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>56%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2178</b>		<b>2917</b>

Overall, 670 (or 69%) out of 1,047 applications for women's programmes were successful. This compares with a total of a success rate of 69 (or 57%) out of 122 applications for men's programmes, and 2,178 (or 54%) out of 4,038 programmes for women and men. None of this is surprising: women have historically constituted the overwhelming majority of participants in community education and in the voluntary sector of the social services, whereas men have constituted the majority in work-based learning.

## 6.2 Ethnicity

This section examines the question whether ethnicity had any impact on the likelihood of benefiting from CLANZ funding. Table 26 below provides information on the number and percentage of funding applications for projects intended for Maori, Pacific people, other ethnic minorities and for Pakeha, mixed or unspecified groups. There is only limited evidence on trends and patterns. However, it seems that higher proportions of applications for Maori

programmes were received in the early years (from 1989 to 1996) and then again more recently (from 2001 to 2004), whereas in the intervening years (from 1997 to 2000) applications for Maori programmes were relatively low. A similar pattern may be seen in the case of applications for Pacific programmes with a somewhat higher proportion of applications in the earlier years and diminished proportions of applications since 1994. In the case of other ethnic minorities the proportions of applications seem to have been highest in the early 1990s and early 2000s with a lower rate in the mid- and late-1990s. Finally, the changes are not as clear-cut in the applications for programmes for Pakeha and mixed programmes. However, it does seem that the late-1990s were characterised by the highest proportion of applications from Pakeha, unidentified, other and mixed groups.

Overall, the overwhelming majority (78%) of applications were for projects for which ethnicity was not explicitly identified. However, 16% were explicitly for Maori, while 3% were explicitly intended for Pacific people and 3% for people from other ethnic minorities. On a population basis it seems therefore that the latter two categories were under-represented.

**Table 26**  
**Number & percentage of applications received by CLANZ, by ethnicity,**  
**1989-2004**

Years	Maori		Pakeha, other & mixed		Pacific		Other ethnic minorities		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1989	138	17%	611	75%	52	6%	11	1%	812
1990	127	29%	276	62%	24	5%	16	4%	444
1991	82	19%	321	75%	14	3%	11	3%	429
1992	55	20%	197	70%	21	7%	9	3%	283
1993	53	20%	185	70%	12	5%	13	5%	264
1994	84	27%	213	68%	11	3%	7	2%	316
1995	39	18%	172	78%	6	3%	3	1%	221
1996	42	15%	235	81%	6	2%	6	2%	290
1997	24	7%	309	91%	2	1%	5	1%	341
1998	24	7%	329	91%	0	0%	7	2%	361
1999	10	3%	299	94%	1	0%	9	3%	320
2000	30	9%	277	81%	8	2%	26	8%	342
2001	32	12%	221	82%	3	1%	14	5%	271
2002	47	21%	166	74%	2	1%	10	4%	226
2003	16	11%	124	82%	2	1%	10	7%	153
2004	17	11%	123	83%	3	2%	6	4%	150
<b>Overall percentage</b>	-	<b>16%</b>	-	<b>78%</b>	-	<b>3%</b>	-	<b>3%</b>	-

<b>Total</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4058</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5208</b>
--------------	------------	----------	-------------	----------	------------	----------	------------	----------	-------------

Table 27 below provides information on the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for projects for Maori, Pacific people, other ethnic minorities and for Pakeha, mixed or unspecified groups. The picture is similar to that for funding applications as presented in the previous Table. Once again there is little evidence of major changes in the distribution of grants on the basis of ethnicity, though the number of grants in all categories fell steadily throughout the period. The overwhelming majority of all grants (77%) were for projects intended for Pakeha, mixed or unspecified groups. Sixteen percent of grants were for projects intended for Maori, while 3% were explicitly intended for Pacific people, and 4% for people from other ethnic minorities. As was the case with applications, it seems that on a population basis the latter two categories were under-represented.

**Table 27**  
**Number & percentage of grants made by CLANZ, by ethnicity,**  
**1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Maori</b>		<b>Pakeha, other &amp; mixed</b>		<b>Pacific</b>		<b>Other ethnic minorities</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	63	19%	240	72%	22	7%	7	2%	332
1990	47	23%	130	64%	14	7%	13	6%	204
1991	34	16%	167	77%	7	3%	10	5%	218
1992	31	18%	124	71%	12	7%	7	4%	174
1993	36	26%	88	63%	8	6%	8	6%	140
1994	64	32%	120	60%	9	5%	7	4%	200
1995	30	20%	111	75%	4	3%	3	2%	148
1996	33	16%	162	79%	5	2%	5	2%	205
1997	15	8%	174	91%	1	1%	2	1%	192
1998	12	6%	199	93%	0	0%	4	2%	215
1999	7	4%	178	94%	0	0%	5	3%	190
2000	22	13%	139	81%	5	3%	6	3%	172
2001	20	13%	124	82%	2	1%	6	4%	152
2002	36	24%	102	69%	0	0%	9	6%	147
2003	12	12%	80	78%	2	2%	8	8%	102
2004	15	12%	105	83%	2	2%	4	3%	126
<b>Overall percentage</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2243</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2917</b>

The information presented in Table 28 below enables us to examine whether there were any differences associated with ethnicity in the percentages of applications which were successful or unsuccessful. The data suggest that



there were considerable ethnic variations from year to year. In only four years (1990, 1991, 1992 & 1998) were the proportions of successful applications for Maori projects lower than the overall average. In every other year the proportion of successful applications for Maori projects was higher than the overall average, and in a number of years it was considerably higher than the overall average. Moreover, the overall average of successful applications for Maori projects (57%) was a little higher than the overall success rate for all applications (56%).

On the other hand, in 6 of the years (1989, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996 & 2002) the proportions of successful applications for Pakeha projects or for those where ethnicity was unidentified, were a little lower than the overall average, in 4 years (1997-2000), the proportions were the same as the overall average, and in the remaining 4 years they were higher. The overall average of successful applications for ethnically unidentified or Pakeha projects (57%) was a little higher than the overall average of success for all applications (55%).

The proportions of successful applications for projects intended for Pacific peoples were marginally lower than the annual average for three years (1991, 1992, 1997). In addition, in 1998, 1999 and again in 2002 a very small number of applications (2, 0 & 2 respectively) resulted in no grants for Pacific projects in those years. In one year, 1995, the proportion was the same as the overall average for that year. However in the remaining seven years the proportions of successful applications for Pacific projects were higher than the overall averages for those years. Although the number of applications was small, the overall average of successful applications for projects intended for Pacific peoples (55%) was the same as the overall average of success for all applications (55%).

As we have seen above, the number of applications for projects for other ethnic minorities was small. On the other hand Table 28 below suggests that the proportion of these projects which were funded by CLANZ was higher than that for any other ethnic group. In only four years (1997, 1998, 1999 &

2000) was the proportion of successful applications lower than the overall average, whereas in ten years it was higher and frequently substantially higher. The overall average of successful applications for projects intended for other ethnic minorities (63%) was a substantially higher than the overall average of success for all applications (55%).

**Table 28**  
**Grants or successful applications as a proportion of all applications,**  
**By ethnicity, 1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Maori</b>	<b>Pakeha, unidentified &amp; mixed</b>	<b>Pacific</b>	<b>Other ethnic minorities</b>	<b>Overall annual average</b>	<b>Total</b>
1989	46%	39%	42%	64%	41%	332
1990	37%	47%	58%	81%	46%	204
1991	41%	52%	50%	91%	51%	218
1992	56%	63%	57%	78%	62%	174
1993	68%	48%	67%	62%	53%	140
1994	76%	56%	82%	100%	63%	200
1995	77%	65%	67%	100%	67%	148
1996	79%	69%	83%	83%	71%	205
1997	63%	56%	50%	40%	56%	192
1998	50%	60%	-	57%	60%	215
1999	70%	60%	0%	56%	60%	190
2000	73%	50%	63%	23%	50%	172
2001	63%	56%	67%	43%	56%	152
2002	77%	61%	0%	90%	65%	147
2003	75%	65%	100%	80%	67%	102
2004	88%	85%	67%	67%	85%	126
<b>Percentage of all grants</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>2243</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2917</b>

### 6.3 Age

This section examines the question whether age had any impact on the likelihood of benefiting from CLANZ funding. In discussing the possible impact of age, it is important to note that projects intended for children and school-age young people were not within CLANZ's funding criteria. Projects and programmes were required to be primarily intended for adults. With this in mind,

\*\*\*\*

Table 29 below provides information on the overall numbers and percentages of funding applications for projects intended for young people under 25, older people over 60, and for people of mixed or unspecified ages. The overwhelming majority of applications (92%) were for projects for which age

was not specified or relevant. Only 6% were explicitly intended for young people under 25 and 2% for older people over 60.

Table 29 also summarises data on the annual number and percentage of applications focused specifically on age-groups. Although the overall number and percentage of age-specific applications was small, there was nevertheless some variation from year to year. This variation is particularly striking in the case of applications for young people's projects. In 1989 79 (or 10% of all) applications were for young people's projects. This number fell over the following years with 41 applications (or 9%) in 1990, 30 (or 7%) in 1991 and 12 (or 4%) in 1992. In 1993 the number rose again to 57 (or 22%, the highest proportionate over the entire period) before falling once again to a level between 1% and 5% in each of the following years. In the case of projects specifically for older people over 60 the annual variations were not as great. The largest numbers of these projects were in 1989 (with 14 applications) and in 2000 (11 applications) and 2001 (12 applications). However proportionately, the variations have been small, ranging between 1% (in 1990, 1992 & 1998) and 4% (in 2001 & 2002) & 5% (in 2003).

**Table 29**  
**Number & percentage of applications received annually by CLANZ,**  
**By age of intended participants, 1989-2004**

Years	Young people - under 25		Older people - over 60		Mixed ages		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1989	79	10%	14	2%	719	89%	812
1990	41	9%	3	1%	399	90%	443
1991	30	7%	9	2%	389	91%	428
1992	12	4%	3	1%	267	95%	282
1993	57	22%	4	2%	202	77%	263
1994	18	6%	6	2%	291	92%	315
1995	6	3%	4	2%	210	95%	220
1996	13	4%	7	2%	269	93%	289
1997	7	2%	7	2%	326	96%	340
1998	5	1%	5	1%	350	97%	360
1999	6	2%	9	3%	304	95%	319
2000	12	4%	11	3%	318	93%	341
2001	5	2%	12	4%	253	94%	270
2002	6	3%	9	4%	210	93%	225
2003	8	5%	8	5%	136	89%	152
2004	4	3%	8	5%	137	92%	149
<b>Overall percentage</b>	-	<b>6%</b>	-	<b>2%</b>	-	<b>92%</b>	-

<b>Total</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4780</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>5208</b>
--------------	------------	----------	------------	----------	-------------	----------	-------------

Table 30 below provides information on the number and percentage of grants made by CLANZ for projects intended for young people under 25, older people over 60, and for people of mixed or unspecified ages. The picture is similar to that for funding applications as presented in the previous Table. Once again there is little evidence of major changes in the distribution of grants on the basis of age. The number of grants for projects intended for mixed ages fell over the period, as did those intended for young people. On the other hand, there was a small increase in the number and proportion of grants for older people, from between 1% & 2% in the ten years from 1989 to 1998, to a proportion of between 5% & 7% in the five years from 2000 to 2004. The overwhelming majority of all grants (77%) were for projects intended for Pakeha, mixed or unspecified groups. Sixteen percent of grants were for projects intended for Maori, while 3% were explicitly intended for Pacific people, and 4% for people from other ethnic minorities. As was the case with applications, it seems that the latter two categories were under-represented on a population basis.

**Table 30**  
**Number & percentage of grants made by CLANZ, by age of intended participants, 1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Young people - under 25</b>		<b>Older people - over 60</b>		<b>Mixed ages</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	6	2%	4	1%	322	97%	332
1990	16	8%	0	0%	188	92%	204
1991	13	6%	3	1%	202	93%	218
1992	4	2%	3	2%	167	96%	174
1993	26	19%	1	1%	113	81%	140
1994	7	4%	4	2%	189	95%	200
1995	3	2%	3	2%	142	96%	148
1996	7	3%	4	2%	194	95%	205
1997	3	2%	4	2%	185	96%	192
1998	0	0%	2	1%	213	99%	215
1999	0	0%	5	3%	185	97%	190
2000	3	2%	9	5%	160	93%	172
2001	2	1%	10	7%	140	92%	152
2002	1	1%	8	5%	138	94%	147
2003	1	1%	7	7%	94	92%	102
2004	2	2%	8	6%	116	92%	126
<b>Overall percentage</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2748</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>2917</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>2748</b>	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-------------	--

The data presented in Table 31 below enables us to examine whether there were any differences associated with age in the percentages of applications which were successful or unsuccessful. In the first place we should note the fact that the total number (151 or 6%) of age-specific grants over the entire period was small. Ninety-four percent of successful applications were not age-specific. Secondly, it seems that the overall proportion of successful applications for projects intended for young people (31%) was very much lower than the 55% overall average for successful applications. Thirdly, it seems that the overall success rate for projects for people 60 and over (58%) was a little above the 55% overall average.

When we examine variations from year to year in the number and proportion of successful applications it seems that there were two contrasting trends. Firstly, the overall number and proportion of successful applications for projects intended for young people seems to have been higher in some years in the early- and mid-1990s (16 or 39% in 1990, 13 or 13% in 1991, 26 or 46% in 1993, 7 or 39% in 1994, 3 or 50% in 1995 & 7 or 54% in 1996) and lower in the late-1990s and early-2000s. Secondly, by way of contrast, with one or two exceptions it seems that the overall success rate for projects for people 60 and over seems to have been higher in the early-2000s (with 9 or 82% in 2000, 10 or 83% in 2001 & 8 or 89% in 2002) than in the earlier years.

**Table 31**  
**Grants or successful applications as a proportion of all applications received,**  
**By age of intended participants, 1989-2004**

<b>Years</b>	<b>Young people: under 25</b>	<b>Older people: over 60</b>	<b>All ages or age unspecified</b>	<b>Overall annual average</b>	<b>N</b>
1989	8%	29%	45%	41%	332
1990	39%	0%	47%	46%	204
1991	43%	33%	52%	51%	218
1992	33%	100%	63%	62%	174
1993	46%	25%	56%	53%	140
1994	39%	67%	65%	63%	200
1995	50%	75%	68%	67%	148
1996	54%	57%	72%	71%	205
1997	43%	57%	57%	56%	192
1998	0%	40%	61%	60%	215
1999	0%	56%	61%	60%	190
2000	25%	82%	50%	50%	172

2001	40%	83%	55%	56%	152
2002	17%	89%	66%	65%	147
2003	13%	88%	69%	67%	102
2004	50%	100%	85%	85%	126
<b>Overall percentage</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>56%</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>2748</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2917</b>

## 7.0 REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS & GRANTS

This section examines the regional distribution of CLANZ applications and grants. It looks at the overall distribution of applications and grants over the entire period. It sheds light on the following questions. Were there any differences between regions in the trends and patterns of applications and grants over the years? Were there any overall differences in the number and percentage of applications and grants between regions? Or between rural and urban areas? Or between the North and South Island? Tables providing data on trends in the number of applications and grants from year to year in each of the regions are included in Appendix B.

Table 32 below provides information on the overall number and percentage of funding applications and grants in each region over the entire period from 1989 to 2004. It also shows the percentage of all applications which were successful in each region. In order to provide an approximate measure of the extent to which these reflect the overall population distribution in the various regions we have drawn on data from the 1996 Census. The 1996 census has been used rather than the 1991 or 2001 censuses because the former date constitutes an approximate mid-point in the period from 1989 to 2004. It should be noted that our data do not permit us to draw direct comparisons between the rates of fund applications and grants in rural and urban areas. Nevertheless we can draw interesting comparisons between regions and districts and between the North and South Island.

**Table 32**  
**Total of Applications and Grants by Region, 1989-2004**

	Applications		Grants		Percent of successful applications
Regions	N	%	N	%	%
Northland	296	5.7%	164	5.6%	55%

<b>Auckland Region</b>	90	1.7%	51	1.8%	57%
<b>Auckland Urban</b>	1021	19.6%	584	20.0%	57%
<b>Hamilton</b>	336	6.5%	172	5.9%	51%
<b>Waikato</b>	198	3.8%	99	3.4%	50%
<b>Bay of Plenty</b>	302	5.8%	155	5.3%	51%
<b>East Coast</b>	45	0.9%	26	0.9%	58%
<b>Hawkes Bay</b>	226	4.3%	130	4.5%	58%
<b>Taranaki</b>	186	3.6%	100	3.4%	54%
<b>Wanganui/ Manawatu</b>	351	6.7%	202	6.9%	58%
<b>Wellington region</b>	116	2.2%	65	2.2%	56%
<b>Wellington urban (Hutt, Porirua)</b>	696	13.4%	388	13.3%	56%
<b>Nelson</b>	268	5.1%	159	5.5%	59%
<b>Marlborough</b>	133	2.6%	91	3.1%	68%
<b>West Coast</b>	72	1.4%	42	1.4%	58%
<b>Christchurch</b>	445	8.5%	228	7.8%	51%
<b>Canterbury</b>	101	1.9%	67	2.3%	66%
<b>Dunedin</b>	165	3.2%	99	3.4%	60%
<b>Otago</b>	73	1.4%	41	1.4%	56%
<b>Southland</b>	91	1.7%	51	1.8%	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5207</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2914</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>56%</b>

Looking firstly, at Auckland, the largest centre of population in New Zealand, it is not surprising to find that the largest number and percentage of applications and grants were made for projects in urban Auckland - about 20% of all applications and grants. However, in view of the fact that its population in 1996 was 997,940 comprising as much as 27.1% of New Zealand's total population, it seems that on a per capita population basis Auckland may well have been under-represented in the number of applications and grants.

Secondly, if we look at the applications and grants in the other four major urban areas, Wellington, Christchurch, Hamilton & Dunedin, it seems that on a population basis both Hamilton and Wellington may well have been over-represented in the number of applications and grants. Whereas Hamilton's population of nearly 160,000 in 1996 comprised 4.3% of New Zealand's

population, their applications numbered 336 or 6.5% of the total and their grants numbered 172 or nearly 6% of all grants. Secondly, whereas urban Wellington's population of nearly 335,500 in 1996 comprised 9.1% of New Zealand's population, their applications numbered 696 or 13.4% of the total and their grants numbered 388 or 13.3% of all grants.

The position in the two largest South Island centres was somewhat different. In the case of Christchurch the number and percentage of both applications and grants was slightly lower than would be expected on the basis of its population. Whereas the number and percentage of applications from Christchurch numbered 445 or 8.5% of the total, and its grants numbered 228 or 7.8% of all grants, the population of Christchurch in 1996 was nearly 331,443 comprising 9% of New Zealand's population. On the other hand in the case of Dunedin the number and percentage of both applications and grants was slightly higher than would be expected on the basis of its population. Whereas its population of nearly 112,300 in 1996 comprised 3% of New Zealand's population, applications from Dunedin numbered 165 or 3.2% of the total, and its grants numbered 99 or 3.4%.

Moving on to look at the position outside the five main urban centres, it seems that in a few areas such as Taranaki, Wanganui/Manawatu and the West Coast, the proportions of funding applications and grants were very similar to the proportion of New Zealand's total population living in those areas. In other areas there were more funding applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis. This was the case in Northland, the Bay of Plenty, Hawkes Bay, the Wellington region, Nelson and Marlborough. Thirdly, in other areas such as the Auckland Region, the Waikato, the East Cape, Canterbury, Otago and Southland, there were fewer applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis.

Looked at in greater detail and on a per capita population basis, the following picture of over- and under-representation in the various regions emerges. In the northern half of the North Island, Northland, with 3.8% of New Zealand's population, and 296 or 5.7% of all funding applications and 5.4% of all grants,



was over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. The Auckland Region (excluding Auckland itself), with 3.2% of New Zealand's population, and 90 or 1.7% of all funding applications and 51 or 1.8% of all grants, was under-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. The Waikato (excluding Hamilton), with 8% of New Zealand's population, and 198 or 3.8% of all funding applications and 99 or 3.4% of all grants, was also under-represented in terms of the number of both applications and grants on a population basis.

In the central North Island, the Bay of Plenty, with 4.5% of New Zealand's population, and 302 or 5.8% of all funding applications and 155 or 5.3% of all grants, was over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. The East Coast, with 1.5% of New Zealand's population, and 45 or 0.9% of all funding applications and grants, was also under-represented on a population basis. The Hawkes Bay, with 3.7% of New Zealand's population, and 226 or 4.3% of all funding applications and 130 or 4.5% of all grants, was over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants. In Taranaki, which had 3.4% of New Zealand's population, 186 or 3.6% of all funding applications, and 100 or 3.4% of all grants, the proportion of applications and grants was very similar to the population ratio.

Similarly, in the southern part of the North Island, Wanganui/Manawatu, with 6.9% of New Zealand's population, and 351 or 6.7% of all funding applications and 202 or 6.9% of all grants, was neither under- nor over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants. On the other hand, the Wellington region (excluding the urban area of Wellington) with 1.1% of New Zealand's population, and 116 or 2.2% of all funding applications and 65 or 2.2% of all grants, was over-represented.

In the South Island it seems that a distinction may be drawn between the two northern regions (where on a population basis there is over-representation of applications and grants) and the rest of the island (where there is under-representation). Nelson, with 2.2% of New Zealand's population, and 268 or

5.1% of all funding applications and 159 or 5.5% of all grants, was significantly over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. Marlborough, with 1.2% of New Zealand's population, and 133 or 2.6% of all funding applications and 91 or 3.1% of all grants, was also over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis.

The West Coast, with 0.9% of New Zealand's population and 72 or 1.4% of all funding applications and 42 or 1.4% of all grants, was over-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. Canterbury (excluding Christchurch), with 3.9% of New Zealand's population, and 101 or 1.9% of all funding applications and 67 or 2.5% of all grants, was significantly under-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. Otago (excluding Dunedin), with 2.2% of New Zealand's population and 73 or 1.4% of all funding applications and 41 or 1.4% of all grants, was significantly under-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis. Southland, with 2.7% of New Zealand's population and 91 or 1.7% of all funding applications and 51 or 1.8% of all grants, was significantly under-represented in terms of the number of applications and grants on a population basis.

If we compare the overall distribution of applications and grants between the North and South Islands on a population basis, we find that the differences were small. Whereas 74.7% of the population lived in the North Island and 25.3% in the South Island in 1996, 74.2% of all applications and 73.3% of grants were awarded for groups in the North Island as compared with 25.8% and 26.7% in the South Island.

Finally, if we compare the number of successful applications as a proportion of all applications across the region, it seems that the lowest success rates for funding applications were in Waikato (excluding Hamilton) (50%), & Hamilton, Bay of Plenty & Christchurch (51%). On the other hand, the highest success rates were in Dunedin (60%), Canterbury (excluding Christchurch) 66%, & Marlborough (71%).

## **5.0 SUMMARY & REFLECTIONS**

This report began by providing an overview of the history of CLANZ. It is important to note that CLANZ was never funded by government to the extent that was initially recommended. The Interim Advisory Committee on Non-formal Education (IAGNE) had envisaged an activist role for CLANZ. Its functions would be to advise the Minister of Education on non-formal education and to distribute to groups a sum which would equal 2% of the total post-school education budget. Although the government supported the Committee's recommendations, and the funds allocated by CLANZ were increased progressively from 136,000 in 1987-8 to \$525,000 in 1990-1, this amount was nowhere near the sum recommended by IAGNE. Nevertheless, it was a start, and the committee set about establishing procedures for advertising and allocating funds to local groups in ways which encouraged applications by those who traditionally might not have heard about the availability of such funds or who might have found it difficult to make formal applications.

The evidence presented in this report suggests that CLANZ did have some success with this in the early years. It was therefore a blow to all concerned when in 1991 CLANZ's mandate to advise the Minister on non-formal education was withdrawn by government, and the funds available for the Committee's administration were cut along with the funds available to allocate to groups. These latter funds were cut from more than \$500,000 to a total of \$200,000 per annum.

In spite of this setback and the fact that the level of funds available to CLANZ has remained static over all these years, this report has produced some evidence that CLANZ has continued to play a small but important role in providing small-scale funding for a number of groups which might not otherwise have received any government funding to enable them to undertake adult education projects over the years. For the most part groups that were funded would not have seen themselves as 'educational'. However their contributions to adult and community education are highly significant.

In its early years when CLANZ had the resources, members of the Committee devoted a considerable amount of time and energy to the task of ensuring that information about the available funds was made widely available. CLANZ produced a newsletter and developed its own mailing-list. In addition, meetings of the Committee were held around the country and efforts were made to provide opportunities for people from the various groups applying to meet personally with Committee members. There is some evidence to suggest that CLANZ succeeded at this time to some extent in reaching some groups which had traditionally been largely excluded from the possibility of applying for educational funds from government.

Once its resources were cut CLANZ could not maintain these processes. However in a very much more limited way, CLANZ did attempt to make contact with as wide a range of groups as possible. Moreover this report has provided evidence to suggest that CLANZ has succeeded in a small way in contributing to many of the equity and citizenship goals which lay at the heart of its founders.

This is not to suggest that CLANZ did not face difficulties from time to time. The report notes the failure of the governments even to adjust the CLANZ funding to take inflation into account. With limited funds available to all groups, tensions arose from time to time, and these tensions inevitably raised questions concerning CLANZ's mandate and composition. Every effort was made by the Committee to secure a membership which continued to reflect the diversity of the field. However questions about the manner of appointment to CLANZ and the 'representativeness' of its members were never resolved entirely satisfactorily.

The report notes that by the time the 1999 Labour-led government took office a question mark hung over CLANZ's future. Over the following few years the question whether or not CLANZ was the most appropriate decision-making body to be distributing small grants to community organisations was raised on several occasions. The report seeks to outline some of the wider changes that

were taking place in tertiary education with a view to placing the discussion of CLANZ's future within a wider context. The report then examines some of the different ways in which this question has been addressed over the past four or five years. The historical section of the report concludes by outlining the TEC's latest proposals for the funding of community groups. It concludes by briefly questioning whether the proposed more localised decision-making process is likely to be more effective than the CLANZ option which continues to function with the administrative support of the TEC.

This report then examines the number of applications made to CLANZ for funding each year. It was noted that the number and value of funding application and grants fell over the years, and especially over the first four years between 1989 and 1992. Since that time the number and value of applications has continued to vary from year to year, with marked falls taking place in 2003 & 2004, possibly occasioned in part by the introduction of the ACE Innovation & Development Fund in 2002. However, the variations in the number and value of grants have not been as large. Overall, a total of 5,212 applications worth nearly \$17 million were received, at an average of 326 applications per annum, and over the same period, from 1989 to 2004, CLANZ awarded a total of 2,917 grants at an average of 182 grants per annum. These grants were worth more than \$3.6 million at an average value of \$1,255 per grant.

Overall, the values of all grants made over the period were as follows:

- 579, or 20% of all grants were for \$500 or less;
- 994 or 34% of grants were for amounts between \$501 and \$1000;
- 717 or 25% of grants were for amounts between \$1001 to \$1500;
- 232 or 11% were \$1501 to \$2000; and
- 295 or 10% were for amounts over \$2000.

In recent years, since 2002, it seems that the proportion of smaller grants of \$1000 or less has fallen, while the proportion of larger grants of more than \$1500 has risen.

The report also looked at the question: what proportion of applications has been successful, as well as the reasons for the rejection of applications. Over the entire period, 2,917 or 56% of all applications were funded fully or in part, with 1,228 or 42% of all successful applications receiving the full sum requested and 1,653 or 57% receiving part of the funds requested. A total of 2,295 applications, at an average of 143 per annum, were declined. This comprised 44% of all applications over the period. Forty-eight percent of those applications which were not accepted for grants, were rejected either because the organisations making the applications or the projects themselves did not fit with CLANZ's funding criteria. Thirty-four percent were declined because they were for projects which were low on CLANZ's priorities. The remaining 16% were declined for a range of other reasons including a lack of sufficient information or because applications were withdrawn.

This report provides information on the kinds of groups, projects and programmes applying for and receiving grants over the years. Applications were received from a very wide range of voluntary organisations and community groups. Of all the groups which applied for funds, 41% were unsuccessful, 57% received no more than one grant per annum and 2% received more than one grant in any single year. The overwhelming majority, 93% of all groups and organisations applying to CLANZ, made only one application in any one year, while only 7% made more than one application.

Each project or programme was classified or coded by type on the basis of whether its primary focus was on providing 'information', 'education or training', 'networking' opportunities, or 'other' including running costs, salaries, buildings, etc. Overall, it seems that the overwhelming majority of applications (77%) were coded 'Education & training' and these applications, with 62% being successful, were also more likely to be approved for funding than any of the others. The second largest category of applications (with 9% of all applications) were those coded 'Networking'. Fifty percent of these were approved for funding. Overall the findings for the various types of project were as follows:

- 297 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Information', and of these 97 (or 33%) were successful;
- 4,022 (or 77% of all applications) were coded 'Education & training', and of these 2,495 (or 62%) were successful;
- 449 (or 9% of all applications) were coded 'Networking', and of these 225 (or 50%) were successful; and
- 441 (or 8% of all applications) were coded 'Other', and of these 100 (or 23%) were successful;

Each project or programme was also coded on the basis of its primary subject area or field. These fields or areas were classified as follows: Community education & development; Family support education; Health education; Bicultural, race relations & Treaty education; Literacy; Maori Language & Culture; Education for New Settlers; Special needs education; Women's issues; Pacific Languages & Culture; Justice & Prison Education; and 'Other' forms of education. Examples are given of programmes and projects in the various fields and information on trends over the period is provided. Overall the findings on the number of applications and grants for projects in the various fields were as follows:

- 1,475 (or 28% of all applications) were coded 'Community education or development', and of these 824 (or 56%) were successful;
- 1,054 (or 20% of all applications) were coded 'Family support education', and of these 602 (or 57%) were successful;
- 470 (or 9% of all applications) were coded 'Health education', and of these 221 (or 47%) were successful; and
- 173 (or 3% of all applications) were coded 'Bicultural, race relations & Treaty education', and of these 117 (or 68%) were successful;
- 295 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Literacy', and of these 151 (or 51%) were successful;
- 588 (or 11% of all applications) were coded 'Maori Language & Culture', and of these 366 (or 62%) were successful;
- 130 (or 2% of all applications) were coded 'New Settlers' education', and of these 85 (or 65%) were successful; and

- 185 (or 4% of all applications) were coded 'Special needs', and of these 92 (or 50%) were successful;
- 383 (or 7% of all applications) were coded 'Women's issues', and of these 272 (or 71%) were successful;
- 96 (or 2% of all applications) were coded 'Pacific Languages & Culture', and of these 53 (or 55%) were successful;
- 53 (or 1% of all applications) were coded 'Justice & Prison Education', and of these 26 (or 49%) were successful; and
- 309 (or 6% of all applications) were coded 'Other', and of these 108 (or 35%) were successful;

The report then looks at the question whether there were any gender, ethnic, age or regional differences in the number and percentage of successful and unsuccessful applicants. On the question of gender, although the data suggest that there were considerable variations from year to year, overall the overwhelming majority of applications (78%) were for projects which were not explicitly gendered. Only 2% were explicitly intended for men, while 20% were explicitly for women. The report also looks at the question whether there were any gender-related differences in the proportions of applications which were successful in obtaining grants. Overall, 670 (or 64%) out of the 1,047 applications for women's programmes were successful, as compared with 69 (or 57%) of 122 applications for men's programmes, and 2,178 (or 54%) of the 4,038 applications for programmes for women and men. None of this is surprising: women have historically constituted the overwhelming majority of participants in community education and in the voluntary sector of the social services (Tobias, 2001, 2003), whereas men have constituted the majority in work-based learning.

On the question of ethnicity and cultural differences, although once again it seems that there were considerable variations from year to year, the overwhelming majority (78%) of all applications were for projects for which ethnicity or cultural background was not explicitly identified. On the other hand, 820 or 16% were explicitly for Maori projects, while 167 or 3% were explicitly intended for Pacific people, and 163 or 3% for people from other



ethnic minorities. The report also examines the question whether there were any ethnic or cultural differences in the proportions of applications which succeeded in obtaining grants. Overall, 477 (or 58%) of the 820 applications for Maori programmes were successful. This compares with 2,243 (or 55%) of the 4,058 applications for programmes for Pakeha, unidentified or mixed groups; 93 (or 56%) of the 167 applications for programmes for Pacific people; and 104 (or 64%) of the 167 applications for people from other ethnic or cultural minorities.

Overall, then, the highest success rate was for applications for 'other ethnic minorities'. This was followed by applications for Maori projects with an average success rate a little higher than that for Pakeha, unidentified and mixed groups (54%) and for all applications (56%). Once again this latter finding is not surprising: previous studies (Tobias, 2001, 2003) suggest that, since the Maori renaissance in the 1980s, by way of contrast with other educational sectors, participation by Maori in ACE programmes has at certain times been higher than that of most other groups. This, it seems, is especially true in the case of ACE programmes directed by Maori themselves.

The report then looks at the question whether age had any impact on the likelihood of benefiting from CLANZ funding. In discussing the possible impact of age, it notes that projects intended for children and school-age young people were not within CLANZ's funding criteria. Projects and programmes were required to be primarily intended for adults. The main finding of the report is that the overwhelming majority of both funding applications (92%) and grants (94%) were for projects for which age was not specified or relevant. Only 6% of applications and 3% of grants were explicitly intended for young people under 25, and 2% of applications and 3% of grants were for older people over 60.

Since such a high proportion of all successful applications were for non-age-specific projects, the report contains only limited data on the question whether there were any age-related differences in the proportions of applications which were successful. Overall, 94 (or 30%) of the 309 applications for

projects intended for young people were successful. This compares with 75 (or 63%) out of the 119 applications for projects for people 60 and over, and 2,748 (or 57%) out of 4,780 projects which were not age-specific. On the basis of these figures it seems that projects for young people were least likely to be funded by CLANZ. This however is likely to reflect the fact that several applicants misunderstood or were unaware of the fact referred to above that CLANZ funding was not intended for projects for children.

Finally the report looks at questions concerning the regional distribution of applications and grants. Although the data do not allow us to draw any clear-cut comparisons between rural and urban areas in the distribution of applications and grants, it does seem that the rural/urban divide is not a clear-cut one.

For the purpose of making regional comparisons on a per capita population basis the report draws on regional population data from the 1996 census. The following are findings on some regional similarities and differences:

- In a few regions such as Taranaki and Wanganui/Manawatu and Dunedin the proportions of funding applications and grants were very similar to the proportions of the New Zealand population living in those areas.
- In some regions there were higher proportions of funding applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis. This was the case in Northland, Hamilton, the Bay of Plenty, Hawkes Bay, the Wellington region (including urban Wellington), Nelson, Marlborough, the South Island West Coast and Dunedin.
- In some regions there were fewer applications and grants than would be expected on a population basis. This was the case in the Auckland Region (including urban Auckland), the Waikato, the East Cape, Canterbury (including Christchurch), Otago (excluding Dunedin) and Southland.

It seems that there was little difference on a population basis between the North and South Islands in the overall distribution of applications and grants.

Whereas 74.7% of the population lived in the North Island and 25.3% in the South Island in 1996, 74.2% of all applications and 73.3% of grants were awarded for groups in the North Island, as compared with 25.8% and 26.7% in the South Island.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

This research project has examined the history of CLANZ. It has also enabled us to gain some insights into patterns and trends in the distribution of CLANZ funding applications and grants over a 16-year period from 1989 to 2004. Many of these have been highlighted in the above summary. For much of the period very limited funds were available in general for ACE programmes in general and in particular those outside educational institutions. Some national voluntary organisations such as the WEAs lost all government funding in the early-1990s and other organisations were under pressure to change their programme offerings so that they met the requirements of the NZQA and hence could qualify to receive EFTS funding.

Within this context and in spite of many difficulties and tensions, the evidence suggests that CLANZ remained one of the very few conduits through which funds were made available to community groups for undertaking ACE programmes. This research has provided useful information on the number, nature and value of grants as well as on the number, nature and value of unsuccessful applications and the kinds of reasons applications were declined. It has also provided some insights into possible answers to questions whether there were any gender, ethnic, age or regional differences in the number and percentage of successful and unsuccessful applicants. In the light of this it is clear that CLANZ or some similar organisation must be maintained in the future. It could be argued that the evidence points to CLANZ's considerable successes in spite of the difficulties which were confronted. These difficulties, as we have seen, included the low level of funding and the relatively limited direct links between CLANZ, government and (at times) the wider field of ACE. If these difficulties can be resolved in the future - and there is no reason why they should not be resolved partly with closer links being established with ACE Aotearoa and the Regional Networks

and with the support of the TEC - it seems that CLANZ or a similar organisation has a potentially vital role to play in the future of ACE

Despite these useful findings a number of questions remain which require further research. For example, we need to explore further the ways in which members were recruited and appointed to CLANZ, what relationships if any were maintained by CLANZ with other key ACE organisations during the period. We need to investigate the extent to which CLANZ reflected in its membership, procedures, etc. the requirements of a Treaty-based organisation. We need to investigate further the extent to which issues of gender, race, class and other factors were taken into account in recruiting and appointing CLANZ members. More attention also needs to be given to understanding the historical development of CLANZ. I am well aware that I have only begun this task, and that a more thorough documentary and interview study would be immensely valuable. Despite efforts to broaden this study this report has necessarily focused somewhat narrowly on CLANZ funding. What is needed now is a further study which would draw on the data and insights gained here but which would have a broader focus on developments and changes in the wider ACE field.

The following are some of the questions which have informed indirectly some aspects of this study. They should be confronted more directly and explicitly in future studies. Did CLANZ succeed in making a contribution to the kinds of equity goals which were held out initially as its *raison d'être*? Did it succeed in contributing effectively to nonformal learning and action for active citizenship and democracy in a society characterised by diversity? Did it succeed in making significant nonformal learning opportunities available to all adults including those from Maori, Pacific, or working class backgrounds whose experiences of the dominant systems of formal schooling had been negative and/or unsuccessful? Did it succeed in contributing equitably to the nonformal learning of young adults and older adults as well as those in their middle years? Did it succeed in contributing equitably to the learning of people living in all parts of New Zealand? Did it make an appropriate contribution to the nonformal learning of migrants and refugees, people with learning difficulties

and others with negative experience of initial schooling? And most importantly how can we ensure that the experiences of the past are not forgotten, and that structures and processes we set in place for the future build effectively on what we can learn from our past experience?

## 7.0 REFERENCES

- Adult Education & Community Learning Working Party. (2001). *Koia! Koia! Towards a Learning Society: The Role of Adult and Community Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- CLANZ. (2005). *Web page*. Retrieved 19 March, 2005, from <http://www.nrc.org.nz/fund/clanz/html>
- CLANZ. (Various). Reports, minutes, etc. Wellington: Community Learning Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Dakin, J. C. (1988). *Focus for Lifelong Learning: The National Council of Adult Education 1938-88*. Wellington: New Zealand council for Educational Research and National Council of Adult Education.
- Harré Hindmarsh, J. (1992). Community and continuing education in 1992: trends and issues. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 2, 179-204.
- Harré Hindmarsh, J. (1996). Mapping the field in the 1990s. In J. Benseman, Findsen, Brian & Scott, Miriama (Ed.), *The Fourth Sector: Adult and Community Education in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 65-76). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Harré Hindmarsh, J., & al, e. (1993). Community and continuing education in 1993: Who is deciding? Who is benefiting? *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 285-318.
- Harré Hindmarsh, J., & Davies, L. (1993). *Vote Education Funding for Adult Education: Who Benefits? Part One: Community Organisations*. Wellington: Ministry of Education and Victoria University of Wellington.
- Hartley, A., (Chair). (1989). *Report of the Learning for Life Non-Formal and Community Education & Training Working Group*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

- Hawke, G. R., (Convener). (1988). *Report of the Working Group on Post Compulsory Education and Training*. Wellington: New Zealand Government.
- Herbert, C. M., (Chair). (1990). *Report of the Learning for Life Non-Formal and Community Education Task Force*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Minister and Associate Minister of Education. (1989). *Learning for Life: One - Education and Training beyond the Age of Fifteen*. Wellington: New Zealand Government.
- New Zealand Labour Party. (1999). *Pathways and Networks: Labour on Adult Education and Community Learning* (pp. 5 & 8). Wellington: New Zealand Labour Party.
- NZACCE. (1983-1999). *AKINA - The ACE Bulletin*: New Zealand Association for Community and Continuing Education.
- Shallcrass, J., (Chair). (1987). *He Tangata: Report by the Interim Advisory Group on Non-formal Education to the Minister of Education*. Wellington: New Zealand Government.
- Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. (2000). *Shaping a Shared Vision: Lifelong Learning for a Knowledge Society* (Initial Report). Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission/Te Ako Pae Tawhiti (TEAC).
- Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. (2001a). *Shaping the Strategy* (Third Report). Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission/Te Ako Pae Tawhiti (TEAC).
- Tertiary Education Advisory Commission. (2001b). *Shaping the System* (Second Report). Wellington: Tertiary Education Advisory Commission/Te Ako Pae Tawhiti (TEAC).
- Tertiary Education Commission Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua. (2005). *A Funding Framework for Adult and Community Education - A Tertiary Education Commission Consultation Document* (pp. 54). Wellington: Tertiary Education Commission Te Amorangi Mātauranga Matua.
- Tobias, R. M. (1990). *Adult Education in Aotearoa/ New Zealand: a critical analysis of policy changes, 1984-1990*. Christchurch: Centre for Continuing Education, University of Canterbury.

- Tobias, R. M. (September 1991). *Lifelong Learning and the 1991 Budget*.  
Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the NZ Association for  
Community and Continuing Education, Masterton.
- Tobias, R. M. (1993). *Summaries of Key Documents in the 1980s*.  
Christchurch: University of Canterbury.
- Tobias, R. M. (1999). *A History of Adult Learning and Education in  
Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Christchurch: Centre for Continuing Education,  
University of Canterbury.
- Tobias, R. M. (December 2001). *Do we have a 'great divide' in lifelong  
learning? Trends in educational participation by adults in Aotearoa New  
Zealand*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the NZ  
Association for Research in Education, Christchurch.
- Tobias, R. M. (2002). Reflections on policy in adult education and community  
learning (ACE), with special reference to 'Koia! Koia! Towards a  
Learning Society'. *New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning*, 30(1), 7-22.
- Tobias, R. M. (May 2003). *Adult & community education: Visions,  
contributions & participation*. Paper presented at the Rebuilding  
Foundations & Participation - National Conference of ACE Aotearoa,  
Christchurch.
- Tobias, R. M. (2004). Lifelong learning policies and discourses: critical  
reflections from Aotearoa, New Zealand. *International Journal of  
Lifelong Education*, 23(6), 569-588.
- Tobias, R. M. (2005). *Review of Adult and Community Education (ACE)  
Funding Framework Consultation Document*. Retrieved March 17, 2005,  
from <http://www.nrc.org.nz/ace/ace.html>

19 May 2005

## APPENDIX A

<p><b>COMMUNITY EDUCATION</b></p> <p><i><b>Learn for life...</b></i></p> <p><b>GRANTS FOR ADULT LEARNING</b></p> <p><b>CLANZ</b></p> <p><b>COMMUNITY LEARNING AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND</b></p>	<p><b>WHAT WE DO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CLANZ (Community Learning Aotearoa New Zealand is a committee which:</li> <li>Distributes funds to non-formal &amp; community learning groups.</li> <li>Promotes &amp; fosters non-formal learning &amp; community learning.</li> <li>Consults with &amp; responds to people involved in non-formal &amp; community learning.</li> </ul> <p><b>THINGS YOU SHOULD KNOW</b></p> <p>Currently we have \$200,000 for distribution to community groups for adult learning.</p> <p>At all times we consider applications in terms of our responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi.</p> <p>We fund only specific learning projects or programmes for adults.</p> <p><i>We give priority to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects &amp; programmes of groups which don't have easy access to other funding;</li> <li>Learning opportunities to make things fairer and strengthen people's choices;</li> <li>Learning opportunities outside the control of school, polytechnics &amp; universities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects where the learners have control of the learning, rather than those where others decide what people need to learn;</li> <li>Local or regional groups rather than national bodies.</li> </ul> <p><i>We give low priority to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>training for individuals;</li> <li>expensive equipment;</li> <li>groups receiving direct funding from Government;</li> <li>national gatherings and conferences.</li> </ul> <p><i>We do not fund:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ongoing salaries &amp; general administration costs;</li> <li>vehicles &amp; buildings;</li> <li>institutions such as schools &amp; polytechnics;</li> <li>projects mainly for children;</li> <li>overseas travel.</li> </ul> <p><b>APPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>Application can be made at any time and will be considered at the next meeting (We meet 3-4 times a year.)</p> <p>Grants are usually for amounts under \$1,500 but we do make some grants for special projects of up to \$10,000.</p> <p><b>CONTACT CLANZ</b></p> <p>If you would like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>application forms</li> <li>a list of CLANZ members</li> </ul> <p>write to CLANZ, etc or contact a CLANZ member.</p>
--	---	--

From issue Number 40 of *AK/NA*, June 1992: 54.



## APPENDIX B

### REGIONAL TRENDS IN APPLICATIONS AND GRANTS

**Table B1**  
**Applications & Grants for Northland & Auckland Region,**  
**1989-2004**

	Northland						Auckland Region				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	40	5%	13	4%	33%	1989	13	2%	6	2%	46%
1990	39	9%	14	7%	36%	1990	18	4%	3	1%	17%
1991	22	5%	5	2%	23%	1991	9	2%	6	3%	67%
1992	18	6%	7	4%	39%	1992	1	0%	1	1%	100%
1993	10	4%	7	5%	70%	1993	3	1%	3	2%	100%
1994	18	6%	14	7%	78%	1994	5	2%	4	2%	80%
1995	24	11%	16	11%	67%	1995	1	0%	1	1%	100%
1996	14	5%	10	5%	71%	1996	2	1%	2	1%	100%
1997	12	4%	9	5%	75%	1997	9	3%	4	2%	44%
1998	22	6%	15	7%	68%	1998	2	1%	1	0%	50%
1999	13	4%	9	5%	69%	1999	2	1%	2	1%	100%
2000	17	5%	10	6%	59%	2000	6	2%	3	2%	50%
2001	14	5%	6	4%	43%	2001	1	0%	1	1%	100%
2002	11	5%	11	7%	100%	2002	6	3%	6	4%	100%
2003	12	8%	9	9%	75%	2003	6	4%	5	5%	83%
2004	10	7%	9	7%	90%	2004	6	4%	3	2%	50%
Total	296	6%	164	6%	55%	Total	90	2%	51	2%	57%

**Table B2**  
**Applications & Grants for Auckland urban area & Hamilton,**  
**1989-2004**

	Auckland urban area						Hamilton				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
<b>1989</b>	161	20%	60	18%	37%	<b>1989</b>	60	7%	29	9%	48%
<b>1990</b>	85	19%	40	20%	47%	<b>1990</b>	21	5%	10	5%	48%
<b>1991</b>	100	23%	45	21%	45%	<b>1991</b>	32	7%	14	6%	44%
<b>1992</b>	79	28%	55	32%	70%	<b>1992</b>	20	7%	17	10%	85%
<b>1993</b>	64	24%	43	31%	67%	<b>1993</b>	20	8%	7	5%	35%
<b>1994</b>	83	26%	53	27%	64%	<b>1994</b>	8	3%	3	2%	38%

<b>1995</b>	52	24%	33	22%	63%	<b>1995</b>	8	4%	4	3%	50%
<b>1996</b>	63	22%	44	21%	70%	<b>1996</b>	16	6%	8	4%	50%
<b>1997</b>	47	14%	32	17%	68%	<b>1997</b>	29	9%	12	6%	41%
<b>1998</b>	55	15%	37	17%	67%	<b>1998</b>	30	8%	17	8%	57%
<b>1999</b>	56	18%	35	18%	63%	<b>1999</b>	15	5%	7	4%	47%
<b>2000</b>	65	19%	29	17%	45%	<b>2000</b>	22	6%	9	5%	41%
<b>2001</b>	36	13%	20	13%	56%	<b>2001</b>	25	9%	13	9%	52%
<b>2002</b>	37	16%	28	19%	76%	<b>2002</b>	14	6%	10	7%	71%
<b>2003</b>	16	11%	11	11%	69%	<b>2003</b>	8	5%	6	6%	75%
<b>2004</b>	22	15%	19	15%	86%	<b>2004</b>	8	5%	6	5%	75%
<b>Total</b>	1021	20%	584	20%	57%	<b>Total</b>	336	6%	172	6%	51%

**Table B3**  
**Applications & Grants for the Waikato & Bay of Plenty,**  
**1989-2004**

	Waikato						Bay of Plenty				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	46	6%	20	6%	43%	1989	66	8%	25	8%	38%
1990	17	4%	6	3%	35%	1990	29	7%	12	6%	41%
1991	22	5%	6	3%	27%	1991	14	3%	6	3%	43%
1992	10	4%	5	3%	50%	1992	7	2%	4	2%	57%
1993	4	2%	0	0%	0%	1993	10	4%	5	4%	50%
1994	10	3%	5	3%	50%	1994	14	4%	10	5%	71%
1995	8	4%	6	4%	75%	1995	12	5%	8	5%	67%
1996	13	4%	11	5%	85%	1996	21	7%	13	6%	62%
1997	9	3%	6	3%	67%	1997	22	6%	12	6%	55%
1998	13	4%	10	5%	77%	1998	23	6%	8	4%	35%
1999	7	2%	1	1%	14%	1999	21	7%	13	7%	62%
2000	2	1%	1	1%	50%	2000	21	6%	13	8%	62%
2001	8	3%	4	3%	50%	2001	13	5%	5	3%	38%
2002	13	6%	7	5%	54%	2002	13	6%	9	6%	69%
2003	7	5%	5	5%	71%	2003	10	7%	7	7%	70%
2004	9	6%	6	5%	67%	2004	6	4%	5	4%	83%
<b>Total</b>	198	4%	99	3%	50%	<b>Total</b>	302	6%	155	5%	51%

**Table B4**  
**Applications & Grants for East Coast & Hawkes Bay,**  
**1989-2004**

	East Coast						Hawkes Bay				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	8	1%	2	1%	25%	1989	13	2%	2	1%	15%
1990	5	1%	1	0%	20%	1990	27	6%	9	4%	33%
1991	1	0%	1	0%	100%	1991	14	3%	9	4%	64%

1992	1	0%	0	0%	0%	1992	14	5%	8	5%	57%
1993	0	0%	0	0%	-	1993	11	4%	7	5%	64%
1994	2	1%	2	1%	100%	1994	20	6%	14	7%	70%
1995	2	1%	2	1%	100%	1995	18	8%	14	9%	78%
1996	4	1%	3	1%	75%	1996	24	8%	20	10%	83%
1997	3	1%	2	1%	67%	1997	14	4%	10	5%	71%
1998	2	1%	1	0%	50%	1998	14	4%	8	4%	57%
1999	3	1%	2	1%	67%	1999	15	5%	6	3%	40%
2000	4	1%	3	2%	75%	2000	13	4%	5	3%	38%
2001	7	3%	6	4%	86%	2001	8	3%	4	3%	50%
2002	0	0%	0	0%	-	2002	6	3%	3	2%	50%
2003	2	1%	1	1%	50%	2003	8	5%	5	5%	63%
2004	1	1%	0	0%	0%	2004	7	5%	6	5%	86%
Total	45	1%	26	1%	58%	Total	226	4%	130	4%	58%

**Table B5**  
**Applications & Grants for Taranaki & Wanganui/Manawatu,**  
**1989-2004**

	Taranaki						Wanganui/Manawatu				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	25	3%	12	4%	48%	1989	41	2%	20	6%	49%
1990	13	3%	4	2%	31%	1990	19	1%	9	4%	47%
1991	13	3%	9	4%	69%	1991	25	1%	17	8%	68%
1992	3	1%	1	1%	33%	1992	22	2%	13	8%	59%
1993	3	1%	1	1%	33%	1993	20	2%	10	7%	50%
1994	4	1%	4	2%	100%	1994	19	2%	9	5%	47%
1995	3	1%	1	1%	33%	1995	14	1%	10	7%	71%
1996	2	1%	2	1%	100%	1996	33	1%	17	8%	52%
1997	10	3%	5	3%	50%	1997	23	0%	15	8%	65%
1998	23	6%	14	7%	61%	1998	26	1%	16	7%	62%
1999	21	7%	12	6%	57%	1999	23	2%	14	7%	61%
2000	22	6%	12	7%	55%	2000	29	1%	14	8%	48%
2001	13	5%	6	4%	46%	2001	20	2%	12	8%	60%
2002	23	10%	14	10%	61%	2002	15	1%	8	5%	53%
2003	4	3%	1	1%	25%	2003	9	2%	7	7%	78%
2004	4	3%	2	2%	50%	2004	13	2%	11	9%	85%
Total	186	4%	100	3%	54%	Total	351	1%	202	7%	58%

**Table B6**  
**Applications & Grants for Wellington Region & Wellington urban area,**  
**1989-2004**

	Wellington Region						Wellington urban area				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	14	2%	5	2%	36%	1989	87	11%	36	11%	41%
1990	7	2%	5	2%	71%	1990	51	12%	32	16%	63%
1991	5	1%	2	1%	40%	1991	47	11%	25	11%	53%
1992	7	2%	4	2%	57%	1992	29	10%	17	10%	59%
1993	10	4%	5	4%	50%	1993	43	16%	17	12%	40%
1994	4	1%	2	1%	50%	1994	35	11%	17	9%	49%
1995	0	0%	0	0%	-	1995	29	13%	20	14%	69%
1996	3	1%	1	0%	33%	1996	31	11%	24	12%	77%
1997	6	2%	2	1%	33%	1997	62	18%	29	15%	47%
1998	9	3%	5	2%	56%	1998	48	13%	28	13%	58%
1999	12	4%	7	4%	58%	1999	59	18%	34	18%	58%
2000	14	4%	7	4%	50%	2000	54	16%	27	16%	50%
2001	4	1%	3	2%	75%	2001	47	17%	26	17%	55%
2002	8	4%	6	4%	75%	2002	30	13%	18	12%	60%
2003	5	3%	4	4%	80%	2003	22	14%	16	16%	73%
2004	8	5%	7	6%	88%	2004	22	15%	22	17%	100%
Total	116	2%	65	2%	56%	Total	696	13%	388	13%	56%

**Table B7**  
**Applications & Grants for Nelson & Marlborough,**  
**1989-2004**

	Nelson						Marlborough				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	43	5%	19	6%	44%	1989	25	3%	10	3%	40%
1990	13	3%	5	2%	38%	1990	12	3%	5	2%	42%
1991	16	4%	6	3%	38%	1991	17	4%	16	7%	94%
1992	14	5%	9	5%	64%	1992	11	4%	10	6%	91%
1993	13	5%	9	6%	69%	1993	11	4%	11	8%	100%
1994	12	4%	10	5%	83%	1994	14	4%	9	5%	64%
1995	19	9%	10	7%	53%	1995	5	2%	4	3%	80%
1996	15	5%	13	6%	87%	1996	5	2%	5	2%	100%
1997	23	7%	18	9%	78%	1997	7	2%	3	2%	43%
1998	27	8%	13	6%	48%	1998	5	1%	3	1%	60%
1999	12	4%	11	6%	92%	1999	3	1%	2	1%	67%
2000	9	3%	5	3%	56%	2000	7	2%	4	2%	57%
2001	17	6%	9	6%	53%	2001	4	1%	2	1%	50%
2002	15	7%	7	5%	47%	2002	3	1%	3	2%	100%
2003	12	8%	7	7%	58%	2003	2	1%	2	2%	100%
2004	8	5%	8	6%	100%	2004	2	1%	2	2%	100%
Total	268	5%	159	5%	59%	Total	133	3%	91	3%	68%

**Table B8**  
**Applications & Grants for the West Coast & Christchurch, 1989-2004**

Applications & Grants for the West Coast & Christchurch, 1989-2004											
	West Coast						Christchurch				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	16	2%	7	2%	44%	1989	56	7%	25	8%	45%
1990	6	1%	6	3%	100%	1990	43	10%	17	8%	40%
1991	4	1%	2	1%	50%	1991	35	8%	14	6%	40%
1992	5	2%	4	2%	80%	1992	16	6%	4	2%	25%
1993	4	2%	2	1%	50%	1993	22	8%	7	5%	32%
1994	5	2%	4	2%	80%	1994	41	13%	25	13%	61%
1995	2	1%	1	1%	50%	1995	18	8%	13	9%	72%
1996	3	1%	1	0%	33%	1996	32	11%	23	11%	72%
1997	1	0%	1	1%	100%	1997	44	13%	22	11%	50%
1998	4	1%	1	0%	25%	1998	31	9%	19	9%	61%
1999	7	2%	3	2%	43%	1999	26	8%	15	8%	58%
2000	2	1%	1	1%	50%	2000	24	7%	9	5%	38%
2001	5	2%	3	2%	60%	2001	23	9%	12	8%	52%
2002	2	1%	1	1%	50%	2002	10	4%	5	3%	50%
2003	3	2%	2	2%	67%	2003	13	9%	8	8%	62%
2004	3	2%	3	2%	100%	2004	11	7%	10	8%	91%
Total	72	1%	42	1%	58%	Total	445	9%	228	8%	51%

**Table B9**  
**Applications & Grants for Canterbury & Dunedin, 1989-2004**

Applications & Grants for Canterbury & Dunedin, 1989-2004											
	Canterbury						Dunedin				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications	Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	20	2%	9	3%	45%	1989	29	4%	12	4%	41%
1990	7	2%	6	3%	86%	1990	15	3%	11	5%	73%
1991	10	2%	7	3%	70%	1991	19	4%	14	6%	74%
1992	5	2%	2	1%	40%	1992	5	2%	3	2%	60%
1993	1	0%	1	1%	100%	1993	12	5%	5	4%	42%
1994	6	2%	5	3%	83%	1994	11	3%	7	4%	64%
1995	2	1%	2	1%	100%	1995	4	2%	1	1%	25%
1996	2	1%	2	1%	100%	1996	5	2%	5	2%	100%
1997	8	2%	6	3%	75%	1997	9	3%	4	2%	44%
1998	6	2%	4	2%	67%	1998	7	2%	5	2%	71%
1999	4	1%	1	1%	25%	1999	9	3%	7	4%	78%
2000	11	3%	7	4%	64%	2000	9	3%	6	3%	67%
2001	7	3%	5	3%	71%	2001	12	4%	9	6%	75%
2002	7	3%	7	5%	100%	2002	7	3%	3	2%	43%
2003	3	2%	1	1%	33%	2003	8	5%	4	4%	50%
2004	2	1%	2	2%	100%	2004	4	3%	3	2%	75%
Total	101	2%	67	2%	66%	Total	165	3%	99	3%	60%

**Table B10**  
**Applications & Grants for Otago & Southland, 1989-2004**

	Otago						Southland				
Years	Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications		Applications		Grants		Percentage of successful applications
	N	%	N	%	%		N	%	N	%	%
1989	18	2%	8	2%	46%	1989	31	4%	10	3%	32%
1990	11	2%	8	4%	17%	1990	5	1%	1	0%	20%
1991	7	2%	4	2%	67%	1991	16	4%	10	5%	63%
1992	6	2%	3	2%	100%	1992	8	3%	6	3%	75%
1993	0	0%	0	0%	100%	1993	2	1%	0	0%	0%
1994	1	0%	0	0%	80%	1994	3	1%	3	2%	100%
1995	1	0%	0	0%	100%	1995	2	1%	2	1%	100%
1996	1	0%	1	0%	100%	1996	0	0%	0	0%	-
1997	1	0%	0	0%	44%	1997	1	0%	0	0%	0%
1998	6	2%	4	2%	50%	1998	7	2%	6	3%	86%
1999	7	2%	5	3%	100%	1999	4	1%	4	2%	100%
2000	4	1%	2	1%	50%	2000	6	2%	5	3%	83%
2001	4	1%	4	3%	100%	2001	2	1%	2	1%	100%
2002	3	1%	1	1%	100%	2002	2	1%	0	0%	0%
2003	1	1%	0	0%	83%	2003	1	1%	1	1%	100%
2004	2	1%	1	1%	50%	2004	1	1%	1	1%	100%
Total	73	1%	41	1%	57%	Total	91	2%	51	2%	56%